

A Reply to the Slanderous Book of Falsehood: Al-Albani: Unveiled

Version 1.0

The Background:

This article is based around an extremely abreviated translation of 'al-Anwaar al-Kaashifah' of Shaykh Ali Hasan, his refutation of 'at-Tanaaqudaat' of Saqqaaf, prepared by brother Dawood Burbank. In this article I have added many more examples of the lies and concoctions of Hasan Ali as-Saqqaaf not only against Shaykh al-Albaanee but against other scholars as well, on top of this adding more detail to various points that brother Dawood, may Allaah reward him, only translated briefly. Furthermore I have replied to all of the 'counter refutations' by Saqqaaf to Shaykh Ali that reached me via the means of his followers in this country.

To date Hasan Saqqaaf still persists in his lies and has refused to retract them, instead he continues to add lies on top of more lies and we pray that Allaah grants him the tawfeeq to repent for his slander and hatred of Ahlus Sunnah before he dies.

I have stated more than once in the article that any reader who still has doubt in what we write, then let him recourse to the work 'at-Tanaaqudaat' of Hasan Saqqaaf and compare his claims to the written words of al-Albaanee and by the Grace of Allaah the truth will become clear to him. The point of this article is not to show that al-Albaanee is error free or even contradiction free for by the grace of Allaah, He has given Shaykh al-Albaanee the quality of readily accepting and correcting himself when his errors are shown to him. Throughout the works of al-Albaanee we find that he corrects himself, asks others to correct him and supplicates for them when they do so. On many occasions we find him, during the course of replying to attacks directed against him by his opponents, accepting some of their points as genuine and correcting himself.

Therefore in conclusion, the purpose of replying to Hasan Saqqaaf is not because he has written a work outlining the mistakes of al-Albaanee. The purpose in replying is because of his filling the book with lies, slanders and concoctions, his incredibly rude and arrogant attitude, his total blindness to justice and his ignorance of the Science of Hadeeth.

I ask Allaah to guide us all to the straight Path and that He forgive any of my mistakes for they are from myself and Shaytaan.

Introduction:

Truly all praise belongs to Allaah, we praise Him, we seek His aid and we seek his forgiveness. And we seek refuge with Allaah from the evils of our souls and from our wicked actions. He whom Allaah guides then no-one can misguide him, and he whom Allaah misguides then no-one can guide.

I bear witness that there is no true god except Allaah, and I bear witness that Muhammad (SAW) is His Slave and Messenger.[1]

Allaah says (translation of the meaning of):

"**Why do you mix truth with falsehood, and conceal the truth knowingly?**" [Family of Imraan (3):71]

And the Messenger of Allaah, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam said,

"Truly it is from the signs of the hour that knowledge will be sought from the small ones" (i.e the people of innovation, those on other than the path of the companions.)[2]

He, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam also said,

"He who defends his brother in his absence, Allaah will defend him in this world and in the Hereafter."[3]

Throughout history it has always been the case that the great pillars of Ahlus Sunnah have been slandered, abused and hated by the people of misguidance and innovation. Thus fulfilling the truth of the hadeeth of the Messenger, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam,

"There will always remain a group of my nation, manifest upon the truth. They will not be harmed by those that oppose them until the affair of Allaah comes about and they are like that."[4]

So of old Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee (RH) was accused of being a Raafidee Shee'a. Ibn Khuzaimah, Abu Ya'la, ibn Taymiyyah and others were accused of being mujassima and

---

[1] From the Khutbah al-Haajah (Speech of Need) which the Prophet, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, would often start his lectures and khutbas by, as is related in Saheeh Muslim and others.

[2] Related by at-Tabaraanee in 'al-Kabeer' from the relation of Abu Umayyah. See 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no. 2207). The commentary (in brackets) is from the words of Abdullaah bin Mubaarak related by ibn Mandah in 'al-Ma'rifah' (2/220/1) with a good sanad. The hadeeth is also related as mawqoof as the saying of ibn Mas'ud (RA) by al-Harawee in 'Dham al-Kalaam' (2/137). See 'as-Saheehah' (no.695) for detailed documentation.

[3] Related by al-Bayhaqi from the relation of Anas (RA), and it is hasan. See 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no. 6575), and 'as-Saheehah' (no.1217) for detailed documentation.

[4] Related by Muslim, Abu Daawood, Tirmidhee and others from the narration of Thawbaan (RA) and it is saheeh.

had lies heaped around them. And in this day and age the shaykh and muhaddith Muhammad Naasir ad-Deen al-Albaanee has had a similar attack launched against him by those that would obstruct the call to the sunnah of the Best of Creation, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, and would do all that they can to make their innovations widespread in the world. And we seek refuge with Allaah from them and their innovations.

Amongst these individuals is the Jordanian writer Hasan Ali as-Saqqaaf who wrote a three volume treatise entitled 'Tanaaqudaat al-Albaanee' (The Self-Contradictions of al-Albaanee) based upon which a work in the English Language was written entitled 'al-Albani Unveiled' Unfortunately both of these books have conveyed many lies and distortions, and through these means have confused and misguided many people. Because of this we felt it our duty, as sincere advice to the Muslims, to produce this treatise outlining the lies of the liars and warning from the deviations that have polluted the pure sunnah of the Messenger, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam.

We know that when the supporters of Hasan Saqqaaf in this country see the following treatise many accusations of 'lies', 'mistranslation' and 'distortions' will fly about. Due to this reason we have included, at the end, all the Arabic sections in the works of al-Albaanee that we have translated from so that any person who doubts what follows may recourse to an Arabic speaking person and verify all that we have translated.

And we ask Allaah that he guide us to the truth, and make us firm in following the footsteps of our righteous predecessors.

Some Principles of Hadeeth:

Before the specific points are delved into it is important here to mention some important principles with regards to the hadeeth science which are necessary for the reader to know in order to fully comprehend what follows.[5]

Principle 1:

The scholars of hadeeth have different sayings relating to the criticism of narrators and various sayings concerning declaration of authenticity or weakness of narrations (i.e. one scholar may have two or more different sayings about a particular narrator or hadeeth), just as a scholar of fiqh may have more than one saying about a single matter, as is often the case with Imaam ash-Shaafi`ee and Imaam Ahmad. This is due to progressive research and further insight into the evidences - but does this mean that they "contradict themselves"?!
For example:

[5] The principles that follow are taken from 'al-Anwaar al-Kaashifah', part translated by brother Daawood Burbank, with a change of order and some summary.

Imaam adh-Dhahabee[6] often agrees with al-Haakim in his 'Talkhees' of the latter's 'al-Mustadrak'; but then he disagrees in either 'al-Meezaan' or 'Muhadhdhab Sunan al-Bayhaqi' or other works.

Ibn al-Jawzi often includes a hadeeth in his book of fabricated narrations, 'al-Mawdoo`aat', which he also includes in his book of answering charges of weakness against hadeeth 'al-`Ilal al-Mutanahiyah'

Ibn Hibbaan often declares a narrator reliable, then we find that he includes him in 'al-Majrooheen', a book of weak narrators.

Ibn Hajr al-Asqalaanee often has different sayings about a particular narrator in his different books: 'Taqreeb at-Tahdheeb', 'Fath al-Baaree', and 'at-Talkhees al-Habeer'.

Are we to say that they contradict themselves?!! No, rather it is due to progressive research!

Examples:

1 - The hadeeth, "He who does not use kuhl (antimony) should apply it an odd number of times - he who does so has done well, and he who does not, then there is no harm..."

Ibn Hajr declares in 'at-Talkhees al-Habeer' (1/102-103) that it has a weakness since al-Husayn al-Hubraani is unknown, but in 'Fath al-Baaree' (1/206) he declares its isnaad to be hasan!

2 - The hadeeth about sending down verse 108 of Surah at-Tawba, that it was sent down concerning the people of Qubaa`.

Ibn Hajr declares its isnaad to be weak in 'at-Talkhees al-Habeer' (1/113), but in 'Fath al-Baaree' (7/195) and in 'ad-Diraayah' (1/97) he declares its isnaad to be saheeh.

3 - The hadeeth of ibn Umar (RA), "Two dead things and two types of blood have been made lawful for us....."

Ibn Hajr quotes it in 'Bulugh al-Maraam' (no. 11) and says, "it contains weakness", but then declares it saheeh in 'at-Talkhees' (1/26)

[6] He is the Muhaddith and Imaam adh-Dhahabee. The work quoted from here, 'at-Talkhees' is his checking to 'al-Mustadrak' of al-Haakim which claimed to include all the ahaadeeth that fulfilled the criteria of Bukhaaree and Muslim but were not included by them. Unfortunately al-Haakim did not live up to this claim and included in his work hundreds of weak and fabricated ahaadeeth and hence the need for this checking. This single example, not to speak of the others, is enough to show the total lack of understanding of the one who challenges to bring 'ten such contradictions' that are mentioned in 'al-Albani Unveiled' from the classical memorising scholars. Would such a person now declare al-Haakim, and the other scholars mentioned incompetent?! Adh-Dhahabee also authored many other works relating to hadeeth science and biographies of narrators, from amongst them: 'Siyar A`laam an-Nubalaa', 'al-Meezaan', and 'ad-Du`afaa'.

4 - The hadeeth, "indeed Allaah and His Angels send blessings upon the first rows"

Imaam Nawawee declares it saheeh in 'al-Majmoo' (4/301), but he only declares it hasan in 'Riyaadh as-Saaliheen' (no. 1090)

5 - The hadeeth, "remember the Destroyer of pleasures: Death"
Ibn Hajr declares it hasan in 'Takhreej al-Adhkaar' [as occurs in 'al-Futoohaat ar-Rabbaaniyyah (4/50)], whereas in 'at-Talkhees' (2/101) he agrees with ibn Hibbaan, al-Haakim and ibn as-Sakn that it is saheeh.

6 - al-Haafidh Ibn Hajr declares the narrator Idrees ibn Yazeed al-Awdi to be reliable in 'at-Taqreeb', but in 'Fath al-Baaree' (2/115) he declares him to be weak.

7 - About Nawf ibn Fadaalah, Ibn Hajr says in 'at-Taqreeb', "Mastoor (condition unknown)", whereas in 'Fath al-Baaree' (8/413) he says of him, "sadooq (truthful)."

8 - About `Abdur Rahmaan ibn 'Abdul `Azeez al-Awsee, Ibn Hajr says in 'at-Taqreeb', "truthful but makes mistakes", but in 'Fath al-Baaree' (3/210) he declares him weak.

9 - In his notes to the 'Muqaddimah Ibn as-Salaah' (1/355-6), Ibn Hajr declares a hadeeth narrated through Muhammad ibn `Ajlaan to be saheeh, whereas in 'Amaali al-Adhkaar' (1/110) he explains that the hadeeth does not rise above the level of hasan.

10 - al-Haafidh ibn Hajr quotes in 'at-Talkhees' (4/176) that an-Nawawee said in 'Rawdah at-Taalibeen' about the hadeeth, "there is no vow in disobedience", "it is weak by agreement of the scholars of hadeeth"; however, ibn Hajr contradicts him by saying, "it was declared saheeh by at-Tahaawee and Abu Alee ibn as-Sakan, so where is the agreement?"

11 - An-Nawawee says in 'al-Majmoo' (2/42) about the hadeeth concerning touching the penis, "is it not but a part of you?", "it is weak by agreement of the memorisers." However the hadeeth has been declared saheeh by ibn Hibbaan, ibn Hazm, at-Tabaraanee, ibn at-Turkamaanee and others, therefore ibn Abdul Haadee says in 'al-Muharrar' (pg.19), "and the one quoting agreement upon it's being weak is mistaken."

So this principle itself is enough to demolish what Saqqaaf and his disciples say from its very foundations!!

Principle 2:

A number of the ahaadeeth about which a scholar may have different sayings are of the class of the hasan hadeeth, about which it is very difficult to tie down to a single rule. Al-Haafidh ad-Dhahabee says in his valuable book, 'al-Mooqizah' (pp. 28-29),

"...And we do not aspire to a single rule/principle for the (class of) hasan which will cover all hasan ahaadeeth, rather I have no hope of that, since how many ahaadeeth there are about which the memorising scholars of hadeeth are undecided as to whether it is hasan or da`eef or saheeh! Indeed a single memorising scholar may change his opinion (ijtihaad) about a single hadeeth, so one day he declares it saheeh and one day hasan and perhaps even declares it to have weakness - and this is true since the hasan hadeeth is declared by the scholar to have a weakness which prevents its rising to the level of saheeh, so in this sense it does have weakness and so the hasan hadeeth will not be free from weakness - and if it were free then it would be saheeh by agreement."

The few ahaadeeth about which the verdicts of Shaykh al-Albaanee have differed fall into this category, so what is said about him is to be said about the previous scholars and Imaams!

Principle 3:

The saying of a scholar, "its isnaad is weak" is not a contradiction of his saying elsewhere, "the hadeeth is hasan" or "the hadeeth is saheeh", since the isnaad may be weak, but the hadeeth itself is saheeh or hasan due to further supporting chains, or other narrations supporting it or attesting to its authenticity.

Imaam as-Suyootee says in 'al-La`aali al-Masnoo`ah' (1/114), "know that the practice of the scholars of hadeeth such as al-Haakim, ibn Hibbaan, al-Uqailee and others was that they would judge a particular hadeeth to be baseless with respect to a particular chain, due to the fact that it's narrator had falsely attached that chain to a certain text, whereas the text itself is well known from other chains...."

Imaam Abu Amr ibn as-Salaah says in, 'Uloom al-Hadeeth' (pp92-93), "if you find a hadeeth with a weak isnaad, then you may say, 'this is weak', meaning that is weak with this isnaad but you may not say, 'this is weak', meaning its text is weak based merely upon the weakness of that chain, since it may be reported by another authentic chain by which the hadeeth is established...."

So Saqqaaf is either ignorant of these facts (as many examples that he quotes of 'self-contradiction' from al-Albaanee are of the same nature as above) and does not know what he is talking about, or he knows and is a liar who conceals the truth! The sweeter of these two possibilities is bitter, and the better of the two is evil!! So how about when he combines the pair of them?!

Principle 4:

"The eloquent speaker is he whose slips of the tongue can be counted, and the noble one is he whose errors can be enumerated"[7]

[7] 'Tabaqaat' of as-Subki (10/52)

And "the fully competent one is he whose mistakes are limited."[8]

Ibn al-Mubaarak (RA), said, "if the good qualities of a person (greatly) outweigh his bad qualities, then his bad qualities are not mentioned, and if his bad qualities (greatly) outweigh his good qualities, then his good qualities are not mentioned."[9]

adh-Dhahabee says in 'as-Siyar' (16/285), "completeness is very rare, so a scholar is praised for the may virtues he has, so good qualities are not buried due to a single failing."

Ash-Sha`bee said, "if you were right ninety-nine time and erred once, they would seize the single error and forget the ninety-nine...."[10]

So even if, for the sake of argument, we were to accept all the criticisms and attacks made by Saqqaaf against shaykh al-Albaanee, then their number, in comparison to the great number of works written by the shaykh and the huge number of ahaadeeth he has checked, and the enormous number of isnaads he has researched and commented upon, is insignificant. Since the number of works of shaykh al-Albaanee printed so far is more than seventy, and the number of his works in manuscript form is as many again if not more, and he has researched and commented on over 30, 000 isnaads, spending sixty years in the study of the books of the Sunnah and being in the company of, and in contact with, its other scholars.

A tiny proportion of Saqqaaf's criticisms are correct and agree with the principle given by the Prophet, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, "he has spoken the truth, but he is a very great liar",[11] since we find that Saqqaaf's usual currency is merely misguidance, deliberate distortions, twisting of words and lies and falsification.

A certain scholar whom Saqqaaf respects and still visits wrote upon the copy of Saqqaaf's work ('Self- Contradictions of al-Albaanee'), "your errors would only deceive a fool, an ignorant person or a malicious one like yourself, and you O (...) unfortunately have gathered all these three qualities in your book, and the points you have quoted against Shaykh Naasir - may Allaah protect him from ignorant ones like you - show only that you have not read a single book about hadeeth and its sciences in your life, and I do not find this unlikely since your desire is fame and not knowledge. O Allaah! Do not take us into account for what the fools amongst us have done."

Some noble brothers mentioned a saying to Saqqaaf's book, "if you wish to become known, then urinate in the well of Zamzam!" - Likewise with Saqqaaf, could he find no other route to fame than by writing what he has against the Scholar of Hadeeth of this age, and by calling Shaykh al-Islaam ibn Taymiyyah a kaafir?!!

---

[8] 'Siyar A`laam an-Nubalaa' of adh-Dhahabee (4/93)
[9] 'Siyar' (8/532)
[10] 'Hilyah al-Awliyaah' of Abu Nu`aym (4/320-321)
[11] Saheeh al-Bukhaaree from Abu Hurayra, in the hadeeth about the devil stealing from the charity

Principle 5:

Many of Saqqaaf's accusations of contradiction refer to two books: a) 'Mishkaat al-Masaabih'[12] and b) 'Saheeh ibn Khuzaymah', both with the Shaykh's footnotes.

It is not permissible to use these a examples in the first place since the shaykh, as any scholar or student of knowledge should know, due to various circumstances and well-known reasons, did only a small amount of checking and footnotes upon these books.

a) As for 'Mishkaat' then the publisher wrote in its Introduction, "We requested that the great scholar of Hadeeth, Shaykh Muhammad Naasir-ud-Deen al-Albaani should help us in the checking of Mishkaat and take responsibility for adding footnotes for any ahaadeeth needing them, and researching and reproducing their sources and authenticity where needed, and correcting any deficiencies, so he agreed to that, may Allaah reward him well. That was done in the first part of the book, but then his time, which is filled with other necessary services to the Sunnah of Allaah's Messenger, may Allaah bless him and grant him peace, became restricted and he excused himself from its continuation, except that we requested that he should provide whatever benefit he was able from his vast knowledge and examine the rest of the book quickly, and add any notes that he found to be necessary and had time to do; he did this, and this was the cause of many points of benefit ..." The Shaykh also explained this himself in 'Silsilah as-Saheehah'[13] (1/346), "It was a case of hurried footnotes due to circumstances which did not allow us to follow up fully the chains of narration of the ahaadeeth which is our usual practice." All of this is known to Saqqaaf, and he has quoted from it in his book !!

b) Likewise as regards 'Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah', the work of checking was not by shaykh al-Albaanee but rather by Dr. Muhammad Mustafaa al-A`zami, who then requested that shaykh Naasir have a general look at his checking and do a general revision, adding anything necessary - such that it would not be a new checking. Therefore, many of the shaykh's notes are extremely abbreviated, or merely the completion of something unfinished by al-A`zami ...

Now, many of the alleged contradictions quoted by Saqqaaf are to be found in these two books, their nos. in Saqqaaf's alleged book of al-Albaanee's contradictions being:

---

[12] Mishkaat al-Masaabeeh is a collection of hadeeth written by at-Tabrizi

[13] 'Silsilah as-Saheehah' is al-Albaanee's collection of saheeh and hasan ahaadeeth, along with detailed documentation and analysis of the various routes and texts of the hadeeth under discussion, and sometimes with a discussion of various points of fiqh and benefit which are derived from the hadeeth. Thus far 6 volumes have been printed each volume containing 500 ahaadeeth. It has a sister book called, 'Silsilah ad-Da`eefah' which is a similar collection of weak and fabricated ahaadeeth. Printed thus far in 5 volumes, each volume containing 500 ahaadeeth.

1-3,5-16,19,20,21,26,32-49,51,52,54-69,72,73,75-78,81-85,87,
90,95,103,143,144,147,153,158,164,188-189,198,199,240-250 !! These in fact constitute nearly half the book!

Further, in order to increase the number of apparent errors and the size of his book, Saqqaaf has repeated a number of the ahaadeeth and his points of criticism in various places with different numbers, for example:

What he quotes on p. 7 he repeats on p. 70 & p. 161 !
Similarly, p. 9 pp. 114, 136 &140 !
p. 10 p. 98 !
p. 10 p. 11 & p. 140 !
p. 64 p. 105 !
p. 96 p. 145 !

And likewise in many other places!
SO WE ASK THE READER TO CONSIDER CAREFULLY WHAT HAS BEEN STATED ABOVE SO THAT HE OR SHE CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND WHAT FOLLOWS.

Unveiling the Lies of Saqqaaf:

The following is a point by point analysis of the slanders contained in 'al-Albani Unveiled'. The format is as follows:

The first number given is the numbering of this article, the second number given is the number of the point in question as found in the book 'Albani Unveiled'. The point begins by the claims of Hasan Saqqaaf, followed by the actual quotes as found in the works of al-Albaanee, followed by a conclusion.

About Shaykh Al-Albaani's Weakening of Ahadith In Shaeeh Al-Bukhari and Muslim Saqqaaf states that the very fact of al-Albaanee weakening these ahaadeeth contradicts his statement in his takhreej of 'Sharh Aqueedah at-Tahaawiyyah' (pp.'s 27-28) "that any hadeeth coming from the Sahih collections of al-Bukhari and Muslim is Sahih, not because they were narrated by Bukhari and Muslim, but because the Ahadith are in fact correct." (See 'Albani Unveiled' pg.7)

This is not what the shaykh says, rather he explains on those pages that whenever he says in takhreej to a hadeeth that is related by Bukhaaree or Muslim, "saheeh", this is not a new ruling from him, but rather informing of the reality of that hadeeth. Five pages before this he explains that the basic principle used by the scholars of hadeeth is that the statement, 'related by the Two Shaykhs (Bukhaaree and Muslim)' or 'related by Bukhaaree' or 'related by Muslim' is sufficient in saying that the hadeeth is authentic.

Then the Shaykh continues, "but this does not mean that every word and letter or sentence in the Two Saheehs is of the station of the Qur`aan and that it is not possible that there be an error or misinterpretation in there from the part of the narrators. And we do not believe, in principle, that any book after the Book of Allaah is perfect...."

Not only this but a few pages after the quote from 'al-Albani Unveiled', in the same introduction, Shaykh al-Albaanee defends his weakening of the isnaad of a hadeeth related by Bukhaaree!

So with this it will become clear to the reader that the first eight examples of 'self-contradiction' in 'al-Albani Unveiled' are actually not contradictions at all, but are in total conformity with what the shaykh writes in his introduction to 'Sharh Aqueedah at-Tahaawiyyah'. It will also become clear to the reader how Saqqaaf plays around, and distorts the statements of al-Albaanee to suit his own ends, and this will become concrete in what follows.

All there remains now is to quote examples from the first eight points mentioned in 'al-Albani Unveiled' to show other types of errors that Saqqaaf falls into, and to show to the reader that al-Albaanee has not done anything new by weakening ahaadeeth in Bukhaaree and Muslim, but that in each and every case he has a precedent in the great scholars of the past.

For example:

1/2: The hadeeth of Abu Zubair from Jaabir,

"Do not sacrifice except a grown animal, unless it is difficult for you in which case sacrifice a ram" [Muslim, Eng. trans. vol. 3 no. 4836]

Saqqaaf merely says that Shaykh al-Albaanee declares it weak in 'Da`eef al-Jaami` al-Sagheer'[14] He fails to mention that he also quotes it in 'as-Silsilah al-Da`eefah' (1/160), since here the shaykh fully discusses its chain and text and quotes Ibn Hazm's declaration of its weakness.[15]

---

[14] This is his checking to as-Suyuti's 'al-Jaami as-Sagheer', being divided into two sections, 'Da`eef' and 'Saheeh'

[15] Most of the ahaadeeth that are declared da`eef in Muslim are due to the narrator Abu Zubair, upon whom there is a difference of opinion over. Shaykh al-Albaanee says in 'ad-Da`eefah' (1/160) while explaining the weakness of the above hadeeth, "this (i.e. the weakness) is because Abu Zubair is a Mudallis and he has related via an`ana. And it is established in the science of hadeeth that the ahaadeeth of a mudallis are not depended upon when he does not make clear who he is narrating from. As was done by Abu Zubair here, for he relates via an`ana and does not make clear who he is narrating from...al-Haafidh adh-Dhahabee says in the biography of Abu Zubair - and his name is Muhammad bin Muslim bin Tadrus - after mentioning the defamation of some of the Imaams of him which does not impair his integrity, '....and as for Muhammad ibn Hazm, then he rejects his ahaadeeth in which he said "from (an) Jaabir" and the likes. Because he is from those who do tadlees. So if he said, "I heard" and "he related to us (akhbaranaa)" then he is depended upon. And ibn Hazm depended upon him when he said, "from (an) Laith bin Sa'd specifically. And that is because

2/3: The hadeeth of Abu Sa`eed al-Khudri,

"The most wicked of people before Allaah on the Day of Resurrection is a man who goes to his wife and she to him, then he divulges her secret." [Muslim, Eng. trans. vol. 2 no.3369]

Saqqaaf, in order to increase his total of the shaykh's alleged errors repeats this hadeeth on following pages, then again later in the book. He again quotes the reference as only 'Da`eef al-Jaami`', and avoids mentioning where shaykh al-Albaanee speaks about it in detail, i.e. 'Aadaab az-Zifaaf' (p. 63, 142), where he explains its weakness at length and shows that al-Dhahabee declared its weakness due to the narrator `Umar bin Hamzah an-Nukri.

3/5: Part of the hadeeth,

"You will be the ones distinguished by white marks and blazes on the Day of Resurrection due to completion of the ablution, [so whoever amongst you can increase his mark and blaze then let him do so]." [Al-Bukhaaree Eng. trans. 1/102 no. 138, Muslim nos. 477-8.]

Saqqaaf again merely quotes 'Da`eef al-Jaami`' and fails to indicate that shaykh al-Albaanee fully explains in 'ad-Da`eefah' (1030) that scholars of the past (e.g. Ibn Hajr, al-Mundhiri, Ibn al-Qayyim and Ibraaheem an-Naaji) have shown how the last part (i.e. in []) is mudraj, i.e. the interpolated words of the narrator only. The rest of the ahaadeeth that Saqqaaf

---

Laith bin Abu Maryam said, 'Laith bin Sa`d narrated to us, "I went to Abu Zubair and he presented to me two books (of hadeeth). So I scrutinised them and I said to myself: maybe I should verify them with him, So I asked him, 'did you hear these from Jaabir?' and he replied, 'some of them I heard and some of them I narrate (haddathtu).' I said, 'let me know which ones you heard' so he told me."'

Then adh-Dhahabee said, "and in Saheeh Muslim are a number of ahaadeeth in which Abu Zubair did not make clear his hearing from Jaabir, and neither are they via the route of Laith bin Sa`d. So there occurs in the heart some (aversion to them)."

Ibn Hajr said in 'at-Taqreeb', about Abu Zubair, "trustworthy, except that he was a mudallis". And he lists him amongst the third degree of mudalliseen in his book, 'Tabaqaat al-Mudalliseen' (pg.15) and said, "famous for tadlees….and an-Nasaa`ee and others declared him as a mudallis." And in the introduction to this book he said, in explanation of the categories, "third: those who frequently relate via tadlees. So the Imaams do not rely upon their ahaadeeth except when they make clear that they heard what they narrate. And from the Imaams of hadeeth are those that reject their ahaadeeth altogether, and from them are those that accept all of their ahaadeeth. For example, Abu Zubair."

I say: and what is correct is the first opinion, and that is accepting what they make clear that they heard, and upon this are the majority of the scholars….

So in conclusion: every hadeeth that Abu Zubair narrates from Jaabir or others with the wording 'an' and the likes, and it is not from the relation of Laith bin Sa`d - then it is necessary to stop depending upon it, until his hearing of the hadeeth is made clear, or we find a witness to the hadeeth in which case it is depended upon."

Then while reading the biography of Imaam Ahmad in 'Siyar A`laam an-Nubalaa' (11/234) with its footnotes by the Muhaddith Shu`ayb al-Arna`oot, he comments on an isnaad containing Abu Zubair, "Its narrators are trustworthy, but in it is the tadlees of Muhammad bin Muslim Abu Zubair….and despite this al-Haakim declared it saheeh (4/96) and adh-Dhahabee agreed."

quotes in this section - not to mention other sections - are quoted in a manner involving twisting of wordings and falsification.

4/7: The hadeeth related by Muslim,

"One who reads the last ten verses of Surah al-Kahf he will be saved from the mischief of the Dajjaal." [Muslim no.809]

Saqqaaf states al-Albaanee made a mistake in the narration of the hadeeth, in his 'Da`eef Jaami` as-Sagheer' (no.5772), and the correct wording is "One who memorises the last ten verses".

But if one were to refer to 'Da`eef al-Jaami` as-Sagheer' then the deception of Saqqaaf would become clear for the mistake here seems to lie with as-Suyuti, the original compiler of 'Jaami` as-Sagheer', not al-Albaanee. For al-Albaanee brings a footnote, "and I say: what is preserved is the wording, 'The one who memorises the first ten verses of Surah al-Kahf....' and it is in 'Saheeh al-Jaami`' (no.6021)"[16]

---

[16] After what had preceded I would like to make clear to the readers the hypocrisy of Hasan Saqqaaf, where he criticises Shaykh al-Albaanee for weakening ahaadeeth in Bukhaaree and Muslim, even though he has a precedent in this from the early muhadditheen., and then goes and himself weakens tens of ahaadeeth in Bukhaaree and Muslim, which contradict his corrupt belief, having no precedent in most of them except with his shaykh in misguidance, Zaahid al-Kawtharee.

Many of these ahaadeeth are related by both Bukhaaree and Muslim! These type of ahaadeeth being considered by the Scholars of Hadeeth as being the most authentic type of hadeeth. Not only this but he goes to the added length of declaring 3 ahaadeeth in Muslim maudu' (fabricated)! So here are examples taken from Saqqaafs footnotes to 'Daf` Shubah at-Tashbeeh':

"1) The hadeeth of the slave girl related by Muslim in which the Prophet, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, asks the question, 'where is Allaah?'. Saqqaaf states (pg.187), 'I am totally sure and supremely confident that the Prophet, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, did not say, "where is Allaah?"'

The hadeeth of Abu Musa (RA) related by Muslim, 'Indeed Allaah does not sleep and does not need to sleep' uptil the point the he, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, said, 'his veil is light, if he were to unveil it....'. Saqqaaf says (pg.102), 'this is a shaadh (irregular) relation.'

The hadeeth of Abu Hurayra in Saheeh Muslim, "Allaah created the dirt on Saturday...". Saqqaaf says (pg.51), 'and this hadeeth contains these feeble sentences which indicate that our Master, the Messenger of Allaah, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, did not speak them.'!

The hadeeth of ibn Mas`ud in Bukhaaree and Muslim, 'a man from the Jews came to the Messenger of Allaah, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, and said, "O Muhammad! Indeed Allaah will place the heavens upon one Finger...."' And in some of it's wording, 'so the Messenger of Allaah, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, laughed in amazement and affirmation of what he said.' Saqqaaf says, 'this is an invalid mistake' (wahm baatil)

The hadeeth of ibn Umar in the Two Saheehs, 'Allaah, Azza wa Jal, will fold up the the heavens on the Day of Judgement with His Hand...' And the hadeeth of Abdullaah bin Umru in Muslim, '...and Both His Hands are Right Hands...'. Saqqaaf says (pg. 208), 'These two narrations destroy each other, because they are from the work of the narrator.'

The hadeeth of Abu Sa`eed al-Kudree (in Bukhaaree), 'Allaah says, "O Adam!" So he says, "Labbaik wa Sa`daik". So He calls with a Voice.....' Saqqaaf says (pg.250), 'it is from the work of the narrator' and discredits it because it is 'a singularly narrated hadeeth (khabr aahaad)'

The hadeeth of ibn Abbaas in Saheeh Muslim, 'the Muslims did not use to look at Abu Sufyaan or sit with him.' Saqqaaf says, 'this is a fabricated hadeeth, and is one of three fabricated ahaadeeth in Saheeh Muslim'!

5/11: Under the heading, "Shortcomings of al-Albaanee in his research in innumerable places and examples of this", he attacks shaykh al-Albaanee's saying concerning the narration of Ibn Mas`ood in marfoo'[17] form,

"The Qur`aan was sent down upon seven modes, each verse of them having an inner and an outer meaning ..."

It is quoted by the compiler of al-Mishkaat (1/80) as being reported by al-Baghawee[18] in 'Sharh-us Sunnah', so Shaykh al-Albaanee added the footnote, "It should be looked into as to where he reports it in 'Sharh-us-Sunnah', since I have searched through the chapters of Knowledge and Virtues of the Qur`aan and have not seen it."

Saqqaaf attacks this saying (p. 22 of the Arabic) with, "This is what you say!! But if you had really checked the chapters of knowledge you would have found it in the 'Chapter of Argumentation about the Qur`aan' in 'Sharh-us-Sunnah' (1/262), and it is reported by Ibn Hibbaan in his 'Saheeh' (no. 74), Abu Ya`laa in his 'Musnad' (5403), at-Tahaawi in 'Sharh Mushkil al-Aathaar' (4/172) and al-Bazzaar (3/90 of 'Kashf al-Astaar') ..."

Thus spoke this ignorant person, making it seem as if he has come up with valuable research, and hiding the truth:

i) He gives the impression that when the shaykh referred to 'Sharh-us-Sunnah', it was in printed form, but this is not the case for it was still in manuscript form then, as shown by a number of his quotes from it in the footnotes.

ii) The hadeeth is NOT REPORTED by al-Baghawi in 'Sharh-us-Sunnah', as our shaykh al-Albaanee indeed said. As for the chapter and page number quoted by Saqqaaf, it is again

---

The hadeeth in the Two Saheehs, 'until The Lord of Honour/Glory places His Foot (on the Hellfire)' Saqqaaf says, 'from those that have been ruled to be irregular (shaadh) and the rejected wording, "until He place His Foot"'
The hadeeth of Anas in Saheeh Muslim, 'a man asked the Prophet: O Messenger of Allaah! Where is my father? He said, "in the Fire" So when the man made ready to leave the Prophet called him and said, "indeed your father and my father are in the fire.' Saqqaaf says in 'Ilqaam al-Hujr' (pg. 74), 'this hadeeth with this wording is shaadh'
The hadeeth of Abu Hurayra in Saheeh Muslim, 'I sought permission from my Lord that I may seek forgiveness for my mother, but He did not allow me....' Saqqaaf says in 'Ilhaam al-Hujr' (pg.71), 'it is not possible from any perspective to seek evidence with this shaadh hadeeth,'"
[Taken from "as-Sawaa`iq wa ash-Shuhub" (pg. 199+) of Shaikh Abu Wadaa`ah al-Atharee, summarised]
So beware of these people that play about with the religion of Allaah, and twist and distort the texts to suit there own deviant desires. And we seek refuge with Allaah from them, and their recompense lies with Him.
[17] Marfoo' (raised) - it means a hadeeth that attributed back to the Prophet, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam, as opposed to Mawqoof - meaning a hadeeth attributed back to the Companion only.
[18] He is...

from his falsehood, since all that is reported there is a mursal narration of al-Hasan al-Basri, with similar wording to the hadeeth of Ibn Mas`ud ![19]

iii) He gives the impression that the shaykh could not find any reference for the hadeeth and therefore himself quotes a list of references, whereas shaykh al-Albaani has fully researched it in 'ad-Da`eefah' (no. 2989 ms.), as he indicated in 'Da`eef al-Jaami`' (no. 1338), and the shaykh attributes to a whole list of reference works, many of which I'm sure Saqqaaf has never even heard of, let alone seen!

The shaykh, may Allaah protect him, said, "... It is reported by Ibn Jareer in his 'Tafseer' (1/23), Abu Umar ar-Raqqi in 'Ahaadeeth of Zaid bin Abi Unaisah' (32/2), Abul Fadl al-Raazi in 'Meanings of Revelation of the Qur'aan in Seven Modes' (64/1), Abu Ya`laa in his 'Musnad' (3/1309), Ibn Hibbaan (1781), al-Bazzaar in his 'Musnad' (226), Ibn Makhlad in 'Al-Muntaqaa' (2/81/2) and Abu Bakr al-Kalaabaadhi in 'Miftaah al-Ma`aani' (297/2)." {7 - important fn!}

6/13: The hadeeth,

"Abu Bakr is from me, holding the position of my hearing".

Al-Albaanee states in as-Saheehah (2/476) that he could not find this hadeeth in the indexes of 'Hilya al-Awliyaa'. Saqqaaf states that this hadeeth is in the indexes and in the book (4/73).

Shaikh Khaalid al-Inbareee says in reply to this point in his, "Iftiraa`aat as-Saqqaaf al-Atheem" (pg.18), "and the Shaykh is truthful and precise in his saying, 'I did not see it in the indexes of 'al-Hilya'.' For I, by Allaah, did not find this hadeeth in the three indexes of 'al-Hilya'. And Saqqaaf lied in affirming (its presence) for what is in 'al-Hilya' in the place which he indicates, and is also present in the indexes, is the hadeeth, 'Abu Bakr and Umar

---

[19] At this point I would like to make clear a very subtle point in the Science of Hadeeth. And that is that a hadeeth which is related as mu`allaq in a book of hadeeth (i.e without an isnaad, or with the isnaad at the end of the collector missing) is not said to be 'reported' by that collector.
So the above hadeeth in question IS found in 'Sharhus Sunnah' (1/263), but it is found as a mu`allaq narration with the isnaad at the end of the collector missing, so it is not 'reported' in Sharhus Sunnah' as Shaykh al-Albaanee originally said and Shaykh Ali endorses above. All that is 'reported' in 'Sharhus Sunnah' is the mursal hadeeth of Hasan al-Basri as mentioned above. For this reason Shaykh Ali Hasan says in 'al-Eeqaaf' (pg.11), "...so how is it said for something that does not have an isnaad: 'reported by (rawaahu)..'?" and then adds a footnote,
"And in this is a reply to what has troubled some of the brothers, over the hadeeth of ibn Mas`ud: 'and every verse has an inward and outward aspect' where I made clear in 'al-Anwaar al-Kaashifah' (pg.45) over the issue of it being reported in 'Sharhus Sunnah', and our Shaikh not coming across it, that this was correct. For he (al-Baghawee) mentions it without his isnaad, so is this called 'reporting' (riwaaya)? And as for the ta`leeq of Bukhaaree then its condition is different...
And Allaah the Most High knows best.

are indispensable to me. Indeed Abu Bakr and Umar are in Islaam of the station of the hearing and seeing of man.'

Shaykh al-Albaanee discusses both the above narrations in 'as-Saheehah' (2/476) and declares the first to be irregular or rejected due to the fact that a group of narrators relate the second hadeeth in which is the mention of both Abu Bakr and Umar.

So in trying to criticise al-Albaanee, Saqqaaf has actually outlined one of the excellent qualities of al-Albaanee, and that is his extreme precision in his takhreej of ahaadeeth!

I do not have the necessary references to crosscheck the rest of the points (9-14 excluding 11, 13) which contain the accusation of insufficient research on the part of al-Albaanee. But in the two examples mentioned so far should be sufficient for the open-minded reader. And Allaah is the One Who grants success.

/15: Saqqaaf states that al-Albaanee criticised Ghumaari for mentioning a hadeeth in his book 'al-Kanz al Thameen' from Abu Hurayra,

'Spread the salaam and feed the poor...'.

He says in 'ad-Da`eefah' (3/492) after referring the hadeeth to Ahmad (2/295)....'I say this is a weak sanad....' and contradicts himself in 'al-Irwaa'[20] (3/238) where he authenticates the same sanad.

al-Albaanee said in 'ad-Da`eefah' (3/492), ".....the hadeeth has another route related from Qataadah from Abu Maymoonah from Abu Hurayra.....I say, this isnaad is da`eef. Daaruqutni said, 'Qataadah from Maymoonah from Abu Hurayra, it is unknown and to be left'...."

And he said in 'al-Irwaa' (3/238), "...from Qataadah from Abu Maymoonah from Abu Hurayra... I say, the isnaad is saheeh, its narrators are the narrators of the Two Shaikhs except for Abu Maymoonah and he is thiqah (trustworthy) as occurs in 'at-Taqreeb'. And al-Haakim said, 'saheeh sanad' and adh-Dhahabi agreed."

So the criticism here seems to be correct, in that al-Albaanee has changed his verdict on the isnaad without indicating that he has done so. Allaah knows best.

7/17: Saqqaaf claimed that al-Albaanee contradicted himself regarding the hadeeth,

by saying in 'Mishkaat' (2/981) that it is da`eef and in 'Ghayatul Maraam'[21] (no.261 pg. 164) that it is saheeh.

[20] This is his in depth checking to the ahaadeeth contained in 'Manar as-Sabeel' one of the standard works of Hanbali fiqh. Printed in 9 volumes.

al-Albaanee said in 'al-Mishkaat' (2/981 fn.1), "its narrators are trustworthy, but it is from the narration of Mukhrima from his father, and he did not hear from him." (Note that the shaykh does not say the isnaad is da`eef and neither does he give a verdict to the hadeeth!!) And he said in 'Ghayatul Maraam' (no.261), "Saheeh...I say its narrators are trustworthy despite the difference over the hearing of Mukhkrima, and he is ibn Bakeer, from his father..."

(There occurs a footnote: 'Shaykh Naasir retracted this saying and declared it weak as in 'Da`eef Sunan an-Nasa`ee' no.221, pg122)

So even if we were to concede the point, then there still could not be a contradiction as al-Albaanee himself retracts the saying.

8/18: Saqqaaf said that al-Albaanee contradicts himself about the hadeeth,

'If one of you was sleeping under the sun, and the shadow covering him shrank, and part of him was in the shadow and the other part in the sun, he should get up.'

by saying "Saheeh" in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (1/266/761) and saying "da`eef" in 'Mishkaat' (3/1337 no.4725)

Albaanee said in 'Saheeh al-Jaami ' (no.748) [not 761 as claimed above]: "Saheeh, related by Abu Daawood from Abu Hurayra" and refers it to as 'Saheehah' (no.737.)

And in 'Mishkaat' (no.4725): "its isnaad (i.e. of Abu Daawood) is weak."

Note that the shaykh has not declared the hadeeth to be da`eef but rather the isnaad, so observe the way that Saqqaaf seeks to deceive the reader!

And this deception becomes all the more apparent if we were to actually refer to 'as-Saheehah' as directed by the shaykh: "Related by Abu Daawood (4822)...via the route ibn Munkadir... who said: 'someone who heard Abu Hurayra informed me...'. This isnaad is saheeh were it not for the unnamed man."

Then he mentions the same hadeeth in Ahmad with his sanad, which omits the unnamed man, states that the isnaad is still linked, and then declares this sanad saheeh according to the criteria of the Two Shaykhs (Bukhaaree and Muslim).

So where is the contradiction?

9/19: Saqqaaf claims yet again that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over a hadeeth,

[21] This is his checking to the ahaadeeth contained in 'the Lawful and Prohibited in Islam' by Yusuf al-Qaradhawi which contains many da`eef ahaadeeth.

'Friday prayer is an obligatory duty upon every Muslim'[22]

by saying "da`eef" in 'Mishkaat' (1/434) and says, 'its narrators are discontinuous[23] as is indicated by Abu Daawood' and by saying "saheeh" in 'al-Irwaa' (no.592)

al-Albaanee says in 'Mishkaat' (1/434), "its narrators are trustworthy being the narrators of Muslim, except that Abu Daawood indicated its being Munqati` by saying, 'Taariq bin Shihaab saw the Messenger (SAW) but did not hear anything from him.'"

And yet again nowhere has the shaykh said that the hadeeth is da`eef!

And in 'Irwaa' (no.592), "Saheeh...Abu Daawood said, (1067),...'Taariq bin Shihaab saw the Messenger but did not hear anything from him.' az-Zayla`i said, 'an-Nawawee said: this does not make it inauthentic, for it is the mursal[24] of the Companion and constitutes a proof, and the hadeeth fulfils the criteria of the Two Shaykhs.'"

So again where is the contradiction as al-Albaanee merely reiterates what he stated briefly in 'Mishkaat' and adds to it in 'al-Irwaa' and then gives a verdict.

/20: Saqqaaf said al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the narrator Muharrar ibn Abu Hurayra because in 'Irwaa' (4/301) he declares him "thiqah"[25] and in 'Saheehah' (4/156) he declares him "maqbool"[26]

al-Albaanee said in 'Irwaa' (4/301), "and its narrators are trustworthy, the narrators are of the Two Shaykhs except al-Muharrar bin Abu Hurayra, and ibn Hibbaan in 'ath-Thiqaat'....and he is thiqah insha`Allaah and the saying of al-Haafidh, 'maqbool' is not maqbool (accepted)."

And in 'as-Saheehah' (4/156), "Muharrar ibn Abu Hurayra is from the narrators of ibn Majah and an-Nasa`ee only. He was not declared thiqah except by ibn Hibbaan....and ibn Hajr said, 'maqbool' i.e. accepted with follow-ups....and the isnaad has another defect...."

So here the criticism seems to be correct. Allaah knows best.

---

[22] The full hadeeth is, "The Friday prayer is an obligatory duty upon every Muslim in congregation, except for four: a slave, a woman, a child, and an ill person."
And it is saheeh as stated in 'al-Irwaa' (3/54 no.592). See also 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.3111) and 'Saheeh Abu Daawood' (no.978).
[23] Munqati` (discontinuous) - that type of isnaad in which a link is missing, usually the missing link being before a Taabi`ee.
[24] Mursal - that type of isnaad in which a link is missing, usually the missing link is between the Taabi`ee and the Prophet, sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam.
[25] Thiqah - refers to that type of narrator who is both precise and reliable.
[26] Maqbool (accepted) - refers to that type of narrator whose narration is accepted only of what he narrates is supported by other narrations, or isnaads.

11/21: Saqqaaf quotes the hadeeth of 'Abdullaah ibn 'Amr,

"Friday Prayer is upon the one who hears the call"

and claims that shaykh al-Albaani's declaration of its being hasan in 'al-Irwaa' contradicts his declaring its isnaad weak in 'al-Mishkaat'.

In Mishkaat (no.1375) al-Albaanee says to the hadeeth, whose source is given as Abu Daawood, "its isnaad (i.e. of Abu Daawood) is da'eef, in it is Qudaama bin Wabra, and he is unknown."

In 'al-Irwaa' (no.593) the shaykh declares that its isnaad is weak, giving the same reason as in 'Mishkaat' but he quotes further support for it and says, "therefore, the hadeeth is hasan if Allaah wills."[27]

So where is the contradiction for saying that the isnaad is weak is different from saying that the hadeeth is weak!

12/22: Saqqaaf quotes the hadeeth of Anas,

"Do not make things difficult for yourselves, lest Allaah makes them difficult for you When a people were hard on themselves, Allaah was hard on them."

and declares that the shaykh has contradicted himself by declaring it da`eef in 'Mishkaat' but hasan elsewhere (e.g. 'Ghayat al-Maraam')

Again, there is no contradiction since he begins his note in 'Ghaayat al-Maraam' (no. 207) by giving it the ruling: da`eef, but then he quotes a mursal narration in support of it and says that it is perhaps hasan due to this. Later, he found a further support that affirms its authenticity (Silsilah as-Saheehah, 3694 ms.)

13/23: About the hadeeth of Aa`ishah,

"Whoever narrates to you that the Prophet, may Allaah bless him and grant him peace, used to urinate standing then do not believe him..."

Saqqaaf claims that the shaykh declared its isnaad weak in 'Mishkaat', but declared the hadeeth saheeh in 'as-Saheehah'.

[27] See 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.3112) where al-Albaanee gives the hadeeth the verdict of hasan, and refers the reader to 'Mishkaat' (no.1375) and 'al-Irwaa' (no.593)!!

In 'Mishkaat' (1/117 no.365), the shaykh declared the narration of at-Tirmidhi weak due to the poor memory of Shareek an-Nakha`i, and he did the same in 'as-Saheehah' (no.201), except that he found a further support for it and so authenticated it.

The shaykh himself explains in 'as-Saheehah' that the notes in 'Mishkaat' were done in haste as has preceded and that he had depended upon the words of at-Tirmidhi, al-I`raaqi, al-Suyooti and others in declaring it weak due to Shareek.[28] Then, when he found that the supporting narration was from other than Shareek, he declared it authentic.

This example (let alone many others), is enough to show the fallacy of what Saqqaaf says as quoted on (page 150) of 'al-Albani Unveiled', "We have left out whatever he had indicated that he previously declared weak and then declared authentic, for example, and we have considered him to be excused with regard to those ahaadeeth, and have overlooked them..." !!

14/24: The hadeeth of `Ammaar,

"There are three whom the angels will not approach: the infidel, the one smeared with dye and the one requiring purification due to intercourse until he makes ablution."

Saqqaaf claims contradiction between the shaykh's declaring it hasan in 'Saheeh al Jaami' and his declaring its isnaad weak in 'Mishkaat'.

The shaykh referred it in both cases to 'at-Targheeb wat-Tarheeb' of al-Mundhiri, except that in the case of declaring it weak in 'Mishkaat' (no.464), he was following al-Mundhiri in that, then when he himself did a checking of 'at-Targheeb', he agreed to al-Mundhiri's saying that its isnaad was munqati` (broken), but he also found two supports to strengthen it.[29] And therefore he declared it hasan in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no. 3061).

15/25: The report from Ibn `Abbaas "that he used to shorten Prayer for the like of the distance between Makkah and Taa`if."

Saqqaaf claims contradiction between the shaykh's saying in 'Mishkaat' (no.1351), "It is a report without an isnad, and so is not authentic", and what he reports in 'al-Irwaa' (3/14 under no.525) from the 'Musannaf' of Ibn Abi Shaybah from Ibn 'Abbaas that he said, "Do not shorten up to `Arafah and the valley of Nakhlah, but shorten when going to 'Usfaan..." These are two different texts!

---

[28] See 'as-Saheehah' (no. 201) where he says, "and I got deceived by their verdicts on this hadeeth when I did the ta`leeq upon 'Mishkaat' - and the ta`leeq was done in haste..."

[29] See 'Adaab az-Zifaaf' (pg.43 fn.1) where Shaikh al-Albaanee says while discussing this hadeeth, "Hasan hadeeth, related by Abu Daawood in his 'Sunan' (2/192-193) via two routes. And Ahmad, at-Tahaawee, and al-Bayhaqi relate one of them, and at-Tirmidhee and others authenticate it. And in this is a problem as I have explained in 'Da`eef Sunan Abu Daawood' (no.29). But the text of the first hadeeth, and it is this one, has two witnesses which al-Haythami relates in 'al-Majma`' (5/156), and due to this I declared it hasan...."

One is a report of Ibn `Abbaas' action while the second is his saying!

16/26: Saqqaaf claimed that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth,

"Leave the Ethiopians alone as long as they leave you. For none will take out the treasure of the Ka`ba except for Dhul Sawayqayain from Ethiopia"[30]

by weakening the hadeeth in 'Mishkaat' (3/1495 no.5429) saying, "the sanad is da`eef" and by authenticating in 'as-Saheehah' (no.772)

al-Albaanee said in 'Mishkaat', after the hadeeth is referred to Abu Daawood, (4/1495 no.5429:), "....with a da`eef sanad" and gives no verdict on the hadeeth.

And in 'Saheehah' (no.882), "related by Abu Daawood...al-Haakim said, 'saheeh sanad' and adh-Dhahabee agreed. I say they erred for Zaheer (a narrator) has weakness as will follow, and Abdul Haqq referred this in 'al-Ahkaam al-Kubraa' (1/110) to ibn Abee Shaybah, then he said, 'Zaheer bin Muhammad has bad memory - he is not depended upon' I say: Musa bin Khabeer (another narrator) has some anonymity...."

See how yet again Saqqaaf tries to deceive the reader by giving only half the story! For al-Albaanee gives the same verdict on the isnaad of the hadeeth in 'Mishkaat' as he does in 'as-Saheehah'. And in 'as-Saheehah' he gives the verdict of the hadeeth to be authentic due to witnesses.

17/27: About criticism that shaykh al-Albaani sometimes praises a person and yet elsewhere attacks them, e.g. Habeeb-ur- Rahmaan al-A`zami al-Hanafi

The shaykh had previously spoken in his favour due to his work in the field of Hadeeth and based upon the principle of assuming good about one's brother until one knows otherwise. Later, when it became clear that this person was a blind-follower who distorts and plays with texts, the shaykh criticised him, so where is the contradiction?! However, the people of innovation ignore each others errors and flatter one another so that the tie of innovation remains between them!

18/28: Saqqaaf claims that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth of Abu Barza, "By Allaah you will not find a man more just than me."

By saying "saheeh" in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.6978), and by saying "da`eef" in 'Da`eef Sunan an-Nasaa`ee' (pg.164 no.287)

al-Albaanee declares the hadeeth of Abu Barza saheeh in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.7101) and refers the reader to 'as-Saheehah' (no.2406)

[30] And it is saheeh. See 'as-Saheehah' (no.772) for detailed documentation.

In 'Da`eef Sunan an-Nasaa'ee' (no. 278 not 287 as above) he says 'da`eef' to a long hadeeth related by Shareek bin Shihaab in which this statement occurs, although the wording of the two is different.

In 'Saheeh al-Jaami' the wording is (transliteration), "wallaahee laa tajidoonee ba`dee a`dala alaykum minnee", and in 'Da`eef Sunan an-Nasaa'ee', "wallaahee laa tajidoonee ba`dee rajulun huwa a`dalu minnee."

In 'as-Saheehah' (no.2406) he declares the hadeeth saheeh, and in his discussion relates another hadeeth from Shareeq bin Shihaab, also related in 'Sunan an-Nasaa`ee' which is similar in wording to the one in 'Da`eef Sunan an-Nasaa`ee', containing the same wording as that of 'Saheeh al-Jaami' and declares it saheeh.
So again there is no contradiction here, just deception on the part of Saqqaaf, may Allaah cure him.

19/29: Saqqaaf claims that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth,

'Throw pebbles at the Jimar by putting the extremity of the thumb on the forefinger.'

by saying in 'Ibn Khuzaimah', "da`eef sanad" and by saying "saheeh" in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' al-Albaanee said in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.910) to the hadeeth,"throw pebbles at the Jimar of the size of a sling shot" [This is the closest wording to the above quoted hadeeth that I could find.]

"saheeh - (related by) Ahmad, ibn Khuzaimah and ad-Diyaa" and refers to 'as-Saheehah' (no.1437).

In 'as-Saheehah' (no.1437) al-Albaanee brings five isnaads to the hadeeth. The first isnaad he declares da`eef. The second, fourth and fifth saheeh, and the third hasan.

Conclusion:

20/32: Saqqaaf claims that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth,

"Let each one of you ask Allaah for all his needs, even for his sandal thong if it gets cut"
by saying "Hasan" in 'Mishkaat' (no. 2251,2252) and saying "da`eef" in 'al-Jaami' (no.4947, 4948)

al-Albaanee state in 'Mishkaat' (no.2252 fn.3), "and it is a hasan hadeeth"

In 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no. 4945, 4946) [not 4947, 4948] he says, "da`eef" and refers the reader to 'ad-Da`eefah' (no.1362)

Again Saqqaaf is guilty of quoting only half the story for if we were to refer to 'ad-Da`eefah' as directed we find the following words, "da`eef, related by at- Tirmidhee...and I declared this hadeeth hasan in my checking to Mishkaat (2251, 2252), and the checking was hurried due to little time...and Allaah is the One that is asked to forgive me my mistakes, and all of them are from me!"

So where is the contradiction if the shaykh himself retracts his verdict on the hadeeth?

Further Unveiling the Lies of Saqqaaf:

21/33: Saqqaaf tries to show that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth of Abu Dharr,

'If you want to fast, then fast in the white shining nights of the 13th, 14th and 15th'

by saying "Da`eef" in 'Da`eef an-Nasa`ee' (pg.84) and his notes upon 'ibn Khuzaimah' (no.2127) saying "Saheeh" in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.1448) and also 'Saheeh an-Nasaa`ee' (no.4021)

(The author of 'Albani Unveiled states: "NB al-Albani mentioned this hadeeth in 'Saheeh' and 'Da`eef an-Nasa`i', which proves he is unaware of what he is classifying, how inept!")

But if we were to investigate the works of al-Albaanee we would find that only the accusers are the ones guilty of ineptitude!

al-Albaanee said in 'Saheeh an-Nasaa`ee' (no.4021), "from Umar (RA), (transliteration), 'fa ayna anta `anil beedi al-garri thalaatha ashrata....'...."

And in 'Da`eef an-Nasaa`ee' (pg84 no.145), "from ibn Hawtaqiyyah who said, 'my father said, "and Arab came to the Prophet....(transliteration), 'in kunta saa'iman fa `alayka bil garril beedi, thalaatha ashrata...'.." And refers the reader to his footnote upon 'ibn Khuzaimah' (no.2127). Then he explains that the statement in the isnaad "from my father" is incorrect and the correct statement is "from Abu Dharr".

And in 'Da`eef an-Nasaa`ee' (pg84 no.146), "from Musa bin Talha, (transliteration), 'fa hallaa thalaatha al-beedi, thalaatha ashrata...'...."

Consider this blatant slander! For these three hadeeth in 'Saheeh' and 'Da`eef an-Nasaa`ee' are three different texts, with three different isnaads from three different companions. Also the context surrounding this statement are worded very differently in all three hadeeth!

22/36: Saqqaaf claimed al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth,

'Whoever buys a carpet to sit on, he has three days to keep it or return it with a cup of dates that are not brownish in colour.'

by weakening the '3 day' part in 'Da`eef an-Nasaa`ee' (pg.186) and by correcting the hadeeth including the '3 day' part in 'Saheehul Jaami' (no.5804)

al-Albaanee said in 'Da`eef an-Nasaa'ee' (pg.186 no.307), "saheeh - the likes (of it is related in Bukhaari and Muslim) without the '3 days'" and refers the reader to 'Ahaadeeth al-buyu' And he said in 'Saheehul Jaami' (no.5928), "saheeh" and refers the reader to 'Ahaadeeth al-Buyu'

So there is no contradiction here whatsoever!

23/37: Saqqaaf claimed that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the hadeeth,

"Whosoever catches a single rak`ah of the Friday prayer has caught (the whole prayer)"

by saying in 'Da`eef an-Nasaa`ee' (pg.49 no78), "shaadh[31] where Friday is mentioned." and by saying in 'al-Irwaa' (3/84 no. 622), "saheeh" to whole hadeeth.

al-Albaanee said in 'Da`eef an-Nasaa'ee' (pg 49, no.78), "shaadh with the mention of Friday, and what is preserved is 'prayer' (in the place of Friday) as in 'Saheeh an-Nasaa`ee' (539-542)."[32]

And in 'al-Irwaa' (3/84 no.622), "Saheeh.....but the saying 'Friday', is shaadh, and what is preserved is 'Prayer' as I shall explain insha`Allaah..." (what follows is 6 pages of explanation)

So again there is no contradiction.

24/38: Saqqaaf states that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the narrator Qanaan bin Abdullaah an-Nahny by saying in 'as-Saheehah' (3/481), 'Qanaan is hasan' and saying in 'ad-Da`eefah' (4/282), 'there is weakness in him.'

al-Albaanee said in 'ad-Da`eefah' (4/282), ".....and this isnaad is weak, Abu Ubaidah did not hear from his father.

And in this Qanaan is weakness."

[31] Shaadh (odd/irregular) according to ash-Shaafi'ee it means, "a hadeeth reported by a trustworthy person, but goes against the narration of a person more reliable than him. It does not include a hadeeth which is unique in it's contents and is not narrated by someone else."
[32] And in 'Saheeh an-Nasaa`ee' (no.543), "the one who catches a rak`ah of the Friday prayer or other than it, then his prayer is completed"

So what is clear is that the Shaykh did not use Qanaan as the (sole) reason for declaring the sanad weak.

And in 'as-Saheehah' (3/481), "...and Qanaan is hasan in hadeeth."

Again where is the contradiction as Hasan means that there is weakness. And al-Albaanee did not use Qanaan as the (sole) reason for declaring the sanad weak in 'ad-Da`eefah'.

25/40: Saqqaaf states that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the narrator Utba ibn Hamid al-Dhabi, by declaring a sanad containing him da`eef in 'al-Irwaa' and hasan in 'as-Saheehah'.

al-Albaanee states in 'al-Irwaa' (5/237), "this isnaad is weak having three weaknesses:

1) Yahya bin Abee Yahya al-Hunaa`ee who is unknown...

2) The weakness of Utba al-Dhabi - al-Haafidh said, 'truthful but has errors (lahu awhaam)'

3) Isma`eel bin Ayaash is weak except for when he narrates from the narrators of Shaam...."

And declares the sanad da`eef.

In 'as-Saheehah' (2/432) he says about Utba bin Hamid, "truthful, but he has errors (lahu Awhaam)" and declares the sanad containing him as being hasan.

So again where is the contradiction as declaring the sanad as hasan due to Utba bin Haamid in 'as-Saheehah' is a clear statement that there is a weakness in him that prevents the sanad from being saheeh. And in 'al-Irwaa' this weakness added to the other two weaknesses makes the sanad there da`eef!

26/41: Saqqaaf claims contradiction over the narrator Hishaam bin Sa`d with the following statements of the shaykh:

al-Albaanee says in 'as-Saheehah' (1/325), "trustworthy, hasan in hadeeth"

And in 'al-Irwaa' (1/283) he says, "but in this Hisham is weakness, arising from his memorisation"

So again where is the contradiction, as saying hasan means that there is a weakness that prevents the narrator from being saheeh.

27/43: Saqqaaf claims that al-Albaanee contradicts himself about the narrator Ali bin Sa`eed al-Raazi, by saying in 'Irwaa' (7/13), "they have said nothing good about al-Raazi"

and by saying in 'as-Saheehah' about a sanad containing al-Raazi, "this is a good sanad and the narrators are trustworthy."

al-Albaanee said in 'Irwaa' (7/13), "I say: and as for al-Raazi they have spoken about him (takallamoo feehee), and between him and al-Munkadir (a narrator) are three people for whom I have not found a biography."

Compare this with the translation given above!

And in 'as-Saheehah' (4/25) he said, "...and this sanad is hasan, its narrators are trustworthy, and Ali al-Raazi has speech (kalaam) about him arising from his memorisation." (he uses this sanad as a support for the sanad of the main hadeeth and says), "in conclusion the hadeeth is affirmed by the gathering of the two routes and its least state is hasan, and Allaah knows best."[33]

So see again how Saqqaaf quotes only half the statement...cutting up the words of al-Albaanee to try and force a contradiction where there is no contradiction, for in both the quotes above the Shaykh reiterates the same criticism for Sa`eed al-Raazi.

28/47: Saqqaaf claims that al-Albaanee contradicts himself about the narrator al-Ijlaa bin Abdullaah al-Kufi by saying in 'al-Irwaa' (8/7), "ibn Abdullaah al-Kufi who is truthful" and by saying in 'ad-Da'eefah' (4/71), "ibn Abdullaah has a weakness" and made him the reason for declaring the sanad weak.

al-Albaanee said in 'ad-Da`eefah' (4/71), "Ijlaa ibn Abdullaah has a weakness and in 'at-Taqreeb', 'he is truthful'...." And he mentions him as one of three reasons for declaring the sanad weak.

So see how again Saqqaaf quotes only half the statement, as is his habit! And see how he exaggerates trying to make the (non-existent) contradiction seem more severe by saying, "and made him the reason for declaring the sanad weak", when he is only one of three!
And in 'al-Irwaa' (8/7), "ibn Abdullaah al-Kufi who is truthful"[34]

Again there is no contradiction here whatsoever!

29/48: Saqqaaf claims that al-Albaanee contradicts himself over the narrator Abdullaah ibn Saalih by saying in 'Da`eefah' (4/302), "How could ibn Saalih be alright and his hadeeth be good, even though he made many mistakes and is of little awareness, which also made some fraudulent ahaadeeth enter his books, and he narrates them without

[33] In 'as-Saheehah' (4/650) al-Albaanee says about Sa`eed al-Raazi, "and he is a well known haafidh, biographies of him are found in 'al-Meezaan' and 'al-Lisaan' and others. And he has speech about him that does not lower his hadeeth from the ranking of hasan."
[34] For similar biographies of him see also, 'as-Saheehah' (3/85, 4/211,247,296)

knowing about them!". He did not mention Ibn Ma`een trusted him, or that he is one of Bukhaaris men.

And by saying in 'as-Saheehah' (2/406), "a good sanad in..." to a sanad containing ibn Saalih. And by saying in 'as-Saheehah', (3/229), "...ibn Saalih has said things which are unharmful with Allaahs help". And by saying in 'as-Saheehah' (4/647), "he is a proof with continuity"

The quote from 'ad-Da`eefah' (4/300) is correct, but yet again Saqqaaf lies for on the same page, al-Albaanee mentions that ibn Ma`een trusted him, by quoting from 'ad-Dua`faa' of adh-Dhahabee, "...and as for ibn Ma`een, then he had a good opinion of him."

The Shaykh said in 'as- Saheehah' (2/406), "a good sanad with follow-ups, (fee al-mutaabi'aat)[35] for its narrators are of Bukhaaree" And again Saqqaaf quotes only half the statement for the second half of the quote shows that the Shaikhs various statements are in conformity with one another. And here again the second lie of Saqqaaf become apparent for al-Albaanee did say that ibn Saalih is one of Bukhaarees men!

And in 'as-Saheehah' (3/229), "the isnaad of the hadeeth is good...and about Abdullaah ibn Saalih are words (said about him) that do not matter here insha`Allaah for the hadeeth has a witness....". Compare this with the translation of the same statement as presented above!
And in 'as-Saheehah' (4/647), "Abdullaah bin Saalih is from the Shuyukh of Bukhaaree and he is a proof with follow-ups (huwa hujjah `inda al-mutaabi'a)"

Then, while reading from 'ad-Da`eefah' (1/62 no.6) I came across another biography of ibn Saalih, through which any doubts that remain are cleared up, "as for ibn Saalih, then in him is a weakness - even though Bukhaaree narrates from him - for ibn Hibbaan said, 'he, in and of himself is truthful. But rejected things occurred in his hadeeth due to his neighbour. For I heard ibn Khuzaimah say, "there was between the two enmity. And his neighbour used to fabricate hadeeth against Shaykh ibn Saalih, and write them in handwriting that resembled the handwriting of ibn Saalih, and throw them into his house amongst his books. And Abdullaah (ibn Saalih) thought that it was his handwriting and therefore narrated them!"'"

This would explain why ibn Saalih is regarded as a proof only when what he narrates is followed up. And this explains why al-Albaanee declared the sanad in 'ad-Da`eefah' (3/229) to be good containing ibn Saalih because the hadeeth had a witness. And this also explains why al-Albaanee declared the sanad containing him as da`eef due to him in the aforementioned quote from 'ad-Da'eefah' (4/300 no.1821) for he begins the analysis by quoting the words of ibn Adee, "I do not know anyone other than Mu`aawiyah relating

[35] "al-Mutaabi`aat" (follow-ups). Meaning other chains of narration are sought to support the chain of narration in question. In this case research is made into the sanad to see if someone else reports from the same narrator that ibn Saalih reports from, and hence strengthen his report.

(this) from Raashid bin Sa`d and from him Abu Saalih (Abdullaah bin Saalih)". Meaning ibn Saalih is alone in this narration, having no follow-ups.

Again there is no contradiction here, just a lot of slanders! And in fact the above example shows the precision of the science of hadeeth, and the precision combined with the depth of understanding of Shaykh al-Albaanee in hadeeth, as compared to the total ignorance of Saqqaaf and his disciples![36]

Attacks on The Shaykh's Literary Skills:

Saqqaaf attempts to attack Shaykh al-Albaanee for what he falsely claims - due to his own ignorance of the Arabic language - are mistakes in the language:

i) He says (p. 6 of 'Tanaaqudaat') that "ansahu li..." (I advise...) is incorrect and should be without the following particle li, whereas a look in any of the dictionaries of the language show that al-Albaani's usage is the correct and pure language [see Mukhtaar as-Sihaah (p. 662) and Al-Misbaah al-Muneer (p. 607) for example], and this in fact occurs in the Qur`aan [Al-A`raaf 7:62, 79, 93; at-Tawbah 9:91; Hood 11:34].

ii) He also tries to correct Shaykh al-Albaanee in places where he has made no error at all in the language, and himself in doing so produces laughable errors - making mistakes in simple grammar!

More Examples of The Shaykh's Alleged Contradictions in Hadeeth Classification:

Saqqaaf brings the heading, "His self-contradiction in declaring a hadeeth to be saheeh in one place but hasan elsewhere"!

This itself indicates that Saqqaaf does not even understand the most basic principles, not to mention its finer points, since as we have mentioned, the level of hasan is one so fine that opinions will vary, even from the same scholar. This is indicated by Imaam al-Dhahabee in 'as-Siyar' (7/338), "... and with this it will become clear that the hasan is a class within the saheeh, and that the Prophetic ahaadeeth really fall into two categories only: saheeh, which is of different levels, or da'eef, which is of different levels, and Allaah knows best."

Hence, to quote Saqqaaf himself (p. 15) we say, "So all that is upon us, O brothers, is to waken and not to be prevented from accepting the truth by the fact that we are not pleased with the one who speaks it, since attention is given to correctness of the saying and its closeness to the truth, and it is Allaah who grants success."

---

[36] Many scholars have refuted this work and other works of Saqqaaf quoting many, many examples of his lies and distortions. We will provide a list of these books at the end inshaa`Allaah. This section is taken entirely from 'Anwaar al-Kaashifah' of Shaykh Ali Hasan with some alteration in the order of points and some summary based upon a translation by Daawood Burbank. The footnotes have been added by myself.

Saqqaaf, who attempts to show contradictions of the shaykh, himself says (p. 16), "Know that al-Albaanee criticises or says that al-Haafidh as-Suyutee, not to mention other great scholars of Hadeeth, has made mistakes in attributing some hadeeth to particular books..." Then he says (p. 18), "And know that Shaykh al-Albaanee in many places attributes ahaadeeth to books and reference works in which they are not to be found, particularly in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' and 'Da'eef al-Jaami', copying and blindly-following therein al-Haafidh al-Suyooti and Shaykh an-Nabahaani without any correction or checking ..." !!

So here are examples where Saqqaaf accuses the shaykh of error when in fact it is he who is in error:

30: Shaykh al-Albaanee says in 'Sifat-us-Salaah' that the hadeeth for moving the finger reported by Waa`il bin Hujr is reported by Abu Daawood. Saqqaaf says (pp. 18-19), "That is not the case, the hadeeth is not reported by Abu Daawood, but by others." However, the hadeeth is indeed reported by Abu Daawood, in the 'Chapter of Raising the Hands.'[37]

But Abu Dawood reports in a summarised form. Abu Dawood says after mentioning one of the narrations of Wail bin Hujr, "al-Hasan bin Alee related to us, from Abu Waleed, from Zaa`ida from Aasim bin Kulaib, with its isnaad and its meaning. He said in it, 'then he placed his right hand upon the back of his left hand and forearm'. And he said in it, 'then I came after that at a time when it was very cold, and I saw the people with cloaks upon them moving their hands beneath their clothes due to the cold.'"

So you see that the hadeeth is via the route of Zaa`ida and he is ibn Qudaama. And the mention of the moving of the finger is well known in his relation.

And the one who knows the methodology of the scholars in summarising ahaadeeth and their narrations, and contents - specifically Imaam Muslim - knows the correctness of Shaikh al-Albaanee referring this hadeeth to Abu Dawood, and the invalidity of the saying of the ignoramuses!

---

[37] Shaykh Saleem al-Hilaalee refers this hadeeth of Wa`il bin Hujr to Abu Dawood (no.772 in the chapter of 'Raising Hands') in his takhreej to the book, 'Blind Following of Madhabs' and the text was, "...then he closed his fingers and made a ring, then he raised his finger and I saw him moving it and making du'a with it; then I came at a time when it was cold and so I saw the people with cloaks upon them moving their hands beneath the clothes due to the cold."
Then I looked in the takhreej to 'Zaad al-Ma`aad' of Ibn al-Qayyim by the scholars Shu`ayb and Abd al-Qaadir al-Arna`oot (1/255 fn.2) and they referred the hadeeth to Abu Dawood amongst others (no.957).
Then I looked into 'Awn al-Ma`bood' (commentary to Abu Dawood) of al-Adheemabaadee under the chapter of pointing the finger, and he to stated this hadeeth to be related by Abu Daawood.

And Imaam at-Tabaraanee related this hadeeth in its entirety in 'al-Mu`jam al-Kabeer' (no.82) via the route of Abu Dawood at-Tayaalisee from Zaa`ida. And in it is the mention of moving the finger.}[38]

31: Saqqaaf (p. 19) quotes eight ahaadeeth from shaykh al-Albaani's 'Da`eef al-Jaami' which are attributed to Ibn Maajah, and claims that none of them are to be found in Ibn Maajah; however, every single one is indeed reported by him!!

1. DJ (6204) = IM (715) 2. DJ (6146) = IM (2982) 3. DJ(5964) = IM (1749)
4. DJ (6013) = IM (2262) 5. DJ (6094) = IM (419) 6. DJ(6103) = IM (2945)
7. DJ (6124) = IM (4043) 8. DJ (6351) = IM (342) !!

32: Another alleged contradiction: Shaykh al-Albaanee placed a footnote regarding a hadeeth in 'Mukhtasar al-`Uluww' (p.98) stating that it was declared by al-Dhahabee to have reliable narrators, and by Ibn al-Qayyim to have a saheeh chain to the standard of al-Bukhaaree. Later, when the shaykh came across its isnaad himself and commented upon an additional wording in it, he declared in 'ad-Da`eefah' (no. 755) that it was munkar with this wording.

Saqqaaf tries to use this as a grave example of contradiction (although al Albaanee clearly never declared it saheeh himself, only quoted other scholars' verdicts), and himself declares the hadeeth to be fabricated. However, all its narrators are indeed those of Saheeh al-Bukhaaree (as stated by al-Dhahabee), and the reason for its weakness is just Fulaih bin Sulaimaan, about whom the scholars differ, some authenticating him, others disparaging him, with al-Bukhaaree and Muslim relying upon him. Hence al-Albaanee concludes that he is truthful with mistakes, so the isnaad has some slight weakness; however, the unacceptability of an additional wording of the hadeeth leads to the verdict of munkar.

Accusation of The Shaykhs Innovative Hadeeth Classification:

Next (p. 34), Saqqaaf seeks to criticise shaykh al-Albaani for dividing the ahaadeeth of the Four Sunan into two classes: Saheeh and Da`eef. Why does he not consider the scholars of the past who did the same thing with Hadeeth books compiled by previous scholars, e.g. 'Mukhtasar Sunan Abi Daawood' of al-Mundhiri, 'Al-Ahkaam al-Sughraa' of Abdul Haqq al-Ishbeeli, 'At-Tajreed' of az-Zubaydi, etc...?!!

33: Saqqaaf quotes (p. 46) the hadeeth of Ibn 'Umar,

"Allaah's Messenger, may Allaah bless him and grant him peace, forbade two kinds of eating: sitting at a table upon which wine is drunk, and that a person eats lying upon his face."

[38] Likewise see a similar discussion by Shaykh Khaalid al-'Anbaree in his 'Iftiraa`aat as-Saqqaaf al-Atheem' (pp16-17).

and the shaykh's declaration of its being weak in 'al-Irwaa', and claims that it contradicts the shaykh's declaration of its being hasan in 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah'.

If Saqqaaf had actually quoted the wording of Ibn Maajah (no, 2716), everyone would have seen his fraudulence, since Ibn Maajah's wording is abbreviated, being only, "Allaah's Messenger, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, forbade that a man should eat while lying upon his face" ! Further, the shaykh himself referred the reader of 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah' to the second checking of 'Irwaa' al-Ghaleel' (no. 1982), which shows clearly that there is no contradiction. In order to cover his tracks, instead of quoting the vol. and page no. of 'al-Irwaa' for the reader to compare, Saqqaaf quotes the reference as 'as-Saheehah' (no. 2394), i.e. a manuscript, so that the reader cannot compare the two texts and see the difference between them!

34: Saqqaaf quotes the hadeeth (pp. 46-47),

"One who repents from a sin is like one who has no sin"

and claims that shaykh al-Albaanee declares it weak in 'ad-Da`eefah', then contradicts himself by quoting it in 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah'.

However, what the shaykh quotes in 'ad-Da`eefah' (no. 615) is the hadeeth, "One who repents from a sin is like one who has no sin, and if Allaah loves a servant, then no sin harms him", then he says after speaking about its isnaad, "The first half of the hadeeth has witnesses from the hadeeth of 'Abdullaah ibn Mas'ood and Abu Sa'eed al-Ansaari ..." and he says in conclusion, "... the hadeeth mentioned above is weak with this full wording, but its first part is hasan due to its combined chains ..."

And from the completeness of the deception of Saqqaaf is that he also fails to mention that in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.3467) the Shaykh declares the above hadeeth hasan and refers the reader to 'ad-Da'eefah' (no.615)!

35: He quotes the hadeeth (pp. 47-48),

"The accounts are three: an account which Allaah will not forgive..."

and says, "Al-Albaanee declares it weak in his checking of 'Mishkaat', ... then how strange and amazing that we find that he has mentioned it in his 'as-Saheehah' (4/560 no. 1927) !" This is not strange at all since shaykh al-Albaanee does not declare it authentic in 'as-Saheehah' (no.1927), but rather uses it as a support for another hadeeth which begins, "Oppression is of three types: oppression which Allaah will not leave alone ...". Further, when the shaykh mentions the hadeeth of the accounts he says, "I have quoted it in 'ad-Da`eefah' (collection of weak ahaadeeth) and 'Mishkaat' (no. 5133)."
36: He quotes the hadeeth,

"The accounts are three: an account which Allaah will not forgive..."

and says, "Al-Albaanee declares it weak in his checking of 'Mishkaat', ... then how strange and amazing that we find that he has mentioned it in his 'as-Saheehah' (4/560 no. 1927) !" This is not strange at all since shaykh al-Albaanee does not declare it authentic in 'as-Saheehah' (no.1927), but rather uses it as a support for another hadeeth which begins, "Oppression is of three types: oppression which Allaah will not leave alone ...". Further, when the shaykh mentions the hadeeth of the accounts he says, "I have quoted it in 'ad-Da`eefah' (collection of weak ahaadeeth) and 'Mishkaat' (no. 5133)."

36: He quotes the hadeeth,

"Whoever cuts off from his brother for a year, it is like spilling his blood"

and mentions that shaykh al-Albaani declares its isnaad to contain weakness in 'Mishkaat' but declares it saheeh in 'as-Saheehah' (no. 928), and then Saqqaaf says, "And there he makes an excuse, where excuses will not benefit him" !! He has thus contradicted himself when he said on his final page that the shaykh had an excuse for ahaadeeth about which he changed his mind, and that he has overlooked these instances!! Hence, he is a liar in both these claims.

As for shaykh al-Albaanee, he says in 'as-Saheehah' (no. 928) after quoting the authentication of the hadeeth by al-Haakim, al-Dhahabee, al-I`raaqee and Ibn al-Wazeer, "It now appears to me to be like that, since all of its narrators except for the Companion are those of Muslim, and I had said in my notes on 'Mishkaat' (5032), 'Its isnaad is weak', and this was based upon the saying of al-Haafidh Ibn Hajr in the biography of al-Waleed in 'at-Taqreeb', 'Weak in hadeeth'. But the saying of Ibn Abi Haatim[39] in 'Al- Jarh wat-Ta'deel' (4/2/20) escaped him, `Abu Zur`ah was asked about him and he said, 'Reliable'.' So when I found this statement of his reliability from the like of this Imaam I relied upon it ... and based upon that I declared the hadeeth to be saheeh, and I turned back from my previous declaration of its weakness, and I have indicated this in my second checking of 'Mishkaat'. Allaah knows best."

37: Saqqaaf quotes (p. 53) the hadeeth,

then claims that shaykh al-Albaanee contradicts himself by declaring it weak in 'Ghaayat al-Maraam' (no. 245), saying, "da`eef with this wording" and declaring it hasan in 'al-Irwaa' (3/407) by saying, "so the hadeeth is hasan."

However, shaykh al-Albaanee quotes the hadeeth with its previous wording in 'al-Irwaa' (no. 894) and says, "saheeh with other than this wording" and in 'Ghaayat al-Maraam', "da`eef with this wording", so where is the contradiction?!

[39] His work 'Jarh wat Ta`deel' is a large biographical work.

Next, the shaykh, after quoting the hadeeth of Muslim, "It is enough sin for a person that he withholds from one whose provision he is in charge of", concludes what he says in 'al-Irwaa' by providing a support for the narration and saying, "... so it may be used as a support, and the hadeeth is hasan."

Further, the shaykh himself, may Allaah protect him, says in 'Ghaayat al-Maraam' (no. 245) that a detailed discussion occurs in 'al-Irwaa', so how is there a contradiction between the two?

38: Saqqaaf quotes the hadeeth (p. 55),

"Most of the fasting of Allaah's Messenger, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, was done on Saturday and Sunday ...",

and claims that the shaykh contradicts himself by declaring it saheeh in his (!) checking of 'Ibn Khuzaimah', and declaring it weak in 'ad-Da`eefah', whereas the shaykh himself explains in the last two lines of his words in 'ad- Da`eefah', "... and I did not notice this weakness in my notes upon 'Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah', so I declared its isnaad hasan, but what is correct is what I have established here, and Allaah knows best."

39: Saqqaaf quotes (pp. 56-57) the hadeeth,

"The Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, sacrificed two horned rams on the Day of Sacrifice, so when he turned them he said: I turn my face to the One who created the heavens ...",

and quotes the shaykh's declaration of its weakness in 'Mishkaat' and claims that what occurs in 'al-Irwaa' contradicts this saying, "He contradicts himself and declares the hadeeth hasan in 'Irwaa' al-Ghaleel' (4/351) ...!"

This is what the liar says, however they are two different ahaadeeth, both in text and isnaad, since the first is about five lines long and is narrated through Abu `Ayyaash from Jaabir, whereas the second is shorter, about two lines long, narrated through 'Abdur Rahmaan ibn Jaabir from his father.

40: He quotes (p. 34) the hadeeth of Abu Sa`eed al- Khudri,

"That the people will follow you and that men will come to you from the different areas of the earth seeking knowledge of the Religion, so when they come to you, treat them well",

and claims that the shaykh declared it saheeh in 'as-Saheehah' but contradicted himself by declaring it weak in 'Mishkaat'.

Again, they are two separate hadeeth with different chains and wordings: the first, "The people will follow you ..." is declared weak by the shaykh in 'Mishkaat' (no. 215) and is reported by way of Abu Haaroon al-'Abdi from Abu Sa'eed; the second, "The Messenger of Allaah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, advised us regarding you ...", which the shaykh declared saheeh in 'as-Saheehah' (no. 280) is reported by way of Abu Nadrah from Abu Sa`eed.

41: Saqqaaf does the same with the hadeeth,

"This is the prayer for the houses",

claiming (p. 62) that shaykh al-Albaanee declares it weak in 'Mishkaat' but hasan in 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah'.

He does not, however, quote the text of the hadeeth in Ibn Maajah, and again they are two separate hadeeth, both in isnaad and text: the first ('Mishkaat' no.1182), "This is the prayer for the houses", is from Ka`b ibn `Ujrah; the second ('Saheeh Sunan' no.956), "Pray these two rak`ahs in your houses" is from Raafi` ibn Khadeej. The first has an unknown narrator in its chain while the second has a hasan chain, so where is the contradiction?!

42: He quotes (p. 65) the hadeeth of Abu Hurairah,

"He who catches a rak`ah of the Friday Prayer, let him join another one to it...",

quoting it in abbreviated form like this, then mentions that shaykh al-Albaanee declares it weak in 'Mishkaat' but saheeh in 'al-Irwaa'.

However, the hadeeth with the full wording is not authentic, and the only part declared weak by the shaykh is the first part, i.e. the only part quoted by Saqqaaf. The shaykh clearly states in 'al-Irwaa' (3/84-90), "In conclusion, the hadeeth with the mention of the Friday Prayer is saheeh from the hadeeth of Ibn `Umar, in marfoo` and mawqoof form, but not from the hadeeth of Abu Hurairah, and Allaah the Most High is the One who grants success."

43: He quotes the hadeeth (p. 69) of Mu`aadh,

"There are no two Muslims for whom three (children) die, except that Allaah enters them into Paradise ...",

and quotes that shaykh al-Albaanee says in 'Miskhaat', "It is reported by Ahmad in 'al-Musnad' and Ibn Maajah, and their isnaad is weak ...", then Saqqaaf declares that the shaykh contradicts himself by reporting it in 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah'.

However, shaykh al-Albaanee said directly after the previous quote, "... and there is a witness for the narration of Ibn Maajah in 'al-Musnad' (5/329) from `Ubaadah ibn as-Saamit" ! This is why the shaykh quotes it in 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah' !

44: He quotes (pp. 69-70) the hadeeth of Shaqeeq ibn Salamah Abu Waa`il,

"I saw 'Uthmaan ibn `Affaan, may Allaah be pleased with him, making ablution ...",

and quotes shaykh al-Albaanee's declaration of the weakness of the isnaad of this particular wording in his note on 'Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah', then says that the shaykh declares it authentic in 'al-Irwaa' and 'Saheeh Ibn Maajah' ...

... Whereas again, they are two different hadeeth in isnaad and text:

That of Ibn Khuzaimah, being reported from 'Aamir ibn Shaqeeq, who is somewhat weak, from Shaqeeq ibn Salamah from 'Uthmaan;

The narration in 'al-Irwaa' is by way of Humraan ibn Abaan from 'Uthmaan and is the narration of the two Saheehs of al-Bukhaaree and Muslim.

The narration of Ibn Maajah is also different and is reported by way of 'Abdah ibn Abi Lubaabah from Shaqeeq ibn Salamah from 'Uthmaan in abridged form. Further, each of the three texts contains parts which are not found in the others.

45: Saqqaaf quotes the hadeeth of Ibn Mas`ood (p. 71),

"When the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, stood upon the minbar, we turned our faces towards him",

and quotes the shaykh as saying in 'Mishkaat', declaring the hadeeth weak due to Muhammad ibn al-Fadl, "... because he is accused of lying, he is accused of that by Imaam Ahmad, Ibn Ma'een and others ...", then says that the shaykh contradicts himself by quoting it in 'Saheeh al-Jaami`'.

However, he fails to quote the completion of what the shaykh said in Mishkaat, "However, it appears that the meaning of the hadeeth is saheeh, refer to Fath al-Baari (332-333)." Further, what is referred to in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' is a different isnaad and is reported in 'Sunan Ibn Maajah' from Thaabit!

46: He quotes (p. 73) the hadeeth,

"Have you not passed the valley of your people in drought, then passed by when it was springing up greenery?"

and says, "Al-Albaanee declares it weak in the checking of 'Mishkaat', saying, 'Its isnaad contains weakness, and some scholars declare it hasan.' Then the man contradicts himself and quotes the hadeeth in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' ... so SubhaanAllaah!"

Where is the contradiction, since in 'Saheeh al-Jaami', shaykh al-Albaanee declares it hasan - is a hasan hadeeth free from weakness? Furthermore, does the saying, "It contains weakness" mean necessarily that the hadeeth is weak ? May Allaah have mercy on Imaam al-Dhahabee who said, "... since the hasan is not free from some weakness, and if it were free from that, then it would be saheeh by agreement." [Not only this but the Shaykh when he discusses this hadeeth in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' refers the reader to 'al-Mishkaat' (no.5531)!]

47: The hadeeth of Samurah,

"Whoever associates with a polytheist and lives along with him, he is like him",

Saqqaaf declares it to be the subject of a contradiction, saying, "Al-Albaanee declares it saheeh in one place, putting it in 'Saheeh al-Jaami', ... then I found that he declared it weak in another place in 'Irwaa' al-Ghaleel' (5/32 - 7 lines from the bottom of the page), saying, 'Abu Daawood reported it. I say: Its isnaad is weak' ..."

The truth is that it is actually declared hasan in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' [and refers the reader to 'as-Saheehah' (no.2330)], and in 'al-Irwaa' it is quoted as a support and the Shaykh declares it's isnaad da'eef but quotes witnesses for it.

[In 'as-Saheehah' the shaykh quotes the hadeeth, declares it's isnaad da'eef, mentions some witnesses for the hadeeth and concludes that the hadeeth is hasan. So there is again no contradiction here,]

48: Saqqaaf quotes (p. 97) the hadeeth,

"When one of you does an action, let him perform it well..."

This is all that he quotes from it, abridging it, then says, "Al-Albaanee declares it saheeh, quoting it in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' with the wording, 'Indeed Allaah loves that when one of you does an action, he does it well.' Then he contradicts himself and judges it to be weak in 'Da'eef al-Jaami' ... so complaint is only to Allaah"!!!

The truth is that this person who accuses shaykh al-Albaanee of abridging sayings of the scholars to take what suits him is himself the true culprit. In this case he omits words from the beginning of the hadeeth first quoted to give the impression that the two are a single hadeeth, whereas they are two separate hadeeth in wording and in chain of narration.

Regarding the isnaad, the hadeeth declared to have weakness is reported in mursal form from 'Ataa' in 'Tabaqaat Ibn Sa'd', and the other hadeeth has a number of chains and

supports which strengthen it, as has been fully explained by the shaykh in ‘as-Saheehah’ (no. 1113).

Regarding the text, the narration declared weak has an addition, "... since it is something which will console one who suffers misfortune", which has no support. Saqqaaf cuts out these words in order to make his false allegation.

49: Saqqaaf quotes (p. 112) the hadeeth of 'Uqbah,

"Whoever learns archery and then abandons it has disobeyed me" and says, "In one version: 'then he is not from us.'

It is reported by Ibn Maajah, and al-Albaanee declares the hadeeth saheeh in ‘Saheeh Ibn Maajah’, saying, 'Saheeh with the wording: then he is not from us.' Then I find him declaring the hadeeth weak in ‘Da'eef al-Jaami', saying: "da`eef..."

What is very clear from the shaykh's words, "Saheeh with the wording: 'then he is not from us'" is the weakness of the wording, "then he has disobeyed me", which is just what the shaykh says in ‘Da`eef al- Jaami', so there is no contradiction!

This is a mere glimpse of Saqqaaf's distortions ignorance and false statements.

"Woe to you, O ignorant innovators! You have wasted our time in having to follow up your foolishness and deceptions! Has not the time come for you to repent and turn back?"

May Allah bless our Prophet Muhammad, His Messenger and slave, and his family and companions, and all those who follow his way after him.

Some Miscellaneous Examples of Errors Taken From ‘Albani Unveiled:

50: Over the hadeeth,

"The Prophet (SAW) used to point with his finger (in tashahhud) and he would not move it" [Abu Daawood]

The author concludes his ‘analysis’ by saying, "Also according to Jamal Zarabozo’s quotation from al-Albani’s checking of Mishkaat ul-Masabih this same hadeeth was of the rank of hasan, and not da`eef as he said in ‘Da`eef Abi Dawood (no.175); is this not a grave contradiction?...."(pg.30 of ‘Albani Unveiled’)

In ‘Da`eef Abu Dawood’ (no. 207 of my edition), al-Albaanee says about the hadeeth, "Shaadh with the wording, ‘and he did not move it’. See ‘Mishkaat’ (912), and ‘Da`eef Sunan an-Nasa’ee (67/1270)"

So where is the contradiction as al-Albaanee refers the reader to his comments upon 'al-Mishkaat' and in al-Mishkaat he says, "the wording 'he would not move it' is shaadh in my view."!!

51: In the chapter on 'The placing of hands in prayer' the author of 'Albani Unveiled' mention the hadeeth of ibn Jareer al-Dabbi from his father who said,

"I saw Ali holding his left arm with his right on the wrist, above the navel"

and quotes al-Albaanee saying in 'The Prophets Prayer Described' (pg 102-103), "this isnaad is candidate for the rank of hasan. Bayhaqi (1/301) firmly designated it to be hasan, and Bukhari (1/301) designated it with certainty while giving it an abridged, ta'leeq form."

The author then goes on to say (pg.31), " al-Albani claimed it was found in Bukhari (1/301), but when I examined the Sahih al-Bukhari (vol1, chapt 6, no 707, pg, 396, English ed.), I did not find the narration of ibn Jarir al-Dabbi (May Allaah be pleased with him) but instead a hadeeth from Sahl ibn Sa`ad....."

This is what the author states, betraying his ignorance of the science of hadeeth! For he looks for a hadeeth in the main text of Bukhaaree, but had he known what the term "ta`leeq" meant he would have found the statement al-Albaanee was referring to!

The ta'leeq form of a hadeeth is when the collector omits the whole isnaad or part of the isnaad on his end and quotes only the text of the hadeeth. This type of narration is commonly found in Saheeh al-Bukhaaree in his chapter headings. Secondly al-Albaanee said that Imaam Bukhaaree mentioned it in abridged form. So what we are looking for is a summary of the above hadeeth, occurring in a chapter heading or the likes.

The statement of Ali occurs in the Book of 'Actions While Praying' (2/160) in the first chapter that "Ali used to place his right hand upon his left...."

In 'Fath al-Baaree' (2/93) ibn Hajr makes clear that this statement is abridged from the hadeeth of ibn Jarir ad-Dabbi from his father, "that when Ali stood for prayer, he would make takbeer and place his right hand upon his left, and he remained like that until he made ruku'..." related by Muslim.

And as al-Albaanee states the wording of this hadeeth with al-Bayhaqi (1/301) is as given at the beginning of this point.

Some Miscellaneous Examples of Lies and Slanders taken from other Works of Saqqaaf:

The purpose of this section is to show the reader that these cases of lies that arise from Hasan Saqqaaf are not just limited to one book, but that lying is his usual currency found in all of his books. I do not intend to compile an exhaustive list, just to mention one or

two from other works to show the trend. Most of what I present below is derived from Arabic photocopies of his works sent to me by his followers in the UK.

In his work 'ash-Shamaateet' dealing with "refuting" what is contained in the various introductions of al-Albaanee to his works, while dealing with the refutation of the introduction to Vol.1 of 'ad-Da`eefah', Saqqaaf attacks al-Albaanee (on pg.47) over his attacking a scholar by the name of al-Ansaaree for authenticating a hadeeth containing a weak narrator, Atiyyah al-Uofee. Saqqaaf states,

"He (al-Albaanee) thinks on pp.'s 22-23 that there is consensus over the weakness of Atiyyah al-Uofee to the extent that he said, 'but what do you say, O you who are attributed to the Ansaar, of this consensus that is quoted by Shaykh al-Islaam ibn Taymiyyah and al-Haafidh adh-Dhahabee of the weakness of Atiyyah who is alone in relating this hadeeth....'"

The Saqqaaf goes on to state, "and all of this from this Self-Contradictor is ignorance and prattle...." And mentions some of the early Imaams that considered Atiyyah to be trustworthy by quoting (pg.48) ibn Hajr's 'Nataa`ij al-Afkaar' (2/414), and goes on to state, "so where is the consensus!! Which this Self-contradictor thinks exists?!! So we say here, 'the one who claims consensus has lied'...and this is good to understand him and those that have been afflicted by him!! For he exaggerates in that which he has no knowledge of!! For he did not see this text, not even in his sleep!! And if he knew it then why did he fall into that which he fell into!!"

This is what the liar and the exaggerator states. For if we were to refer to the introduction of 'ad-Da`eefah' (pp9+) we would find that al-Albaanee says something very different, and Saqqaaf is fully aware of this!

al-Albaanee begins his analysis by stating that the early Muhadditheen had a difference of opinion over Atiyyah, some considering him to be trustworthy, and he makes reference to ibn Hajrs considering the hadeeth in question to be hasan. Then he goes on to state that the vast majority, nay the consensus of the muta`akhireen (later scholars amongst them ibn Hajr himself in more than one of his works) was that he was weak and lists some of their names running into twenty odd, and says there are many more...Then he asks al-Ansaaree the question that Saqqaaf quotes out of context, "but what would you say, O you who are attributed to the Ansaar, of this consensus [of the muta`akhkhireen] that is quoted by Shaykh al-Islaam ibn Taymiyyah and al-Haafidh adh-Dhahabee of the weakness of Atiyyah who is alone in relating this hadeeth......"

In this work there many more examples of such lies, exaggerations and play with words, but I will suffice with just this one, otherwise this article will become very long!

Saqqaaf states in another one of his works, 'Qamoos ash-Shataa`im' (pg56), "that the Shaykh, the Muhaddith!! Acknowledges in his introduction to 'Sifah as-Salaah' that the phrase that is placed on the cover of the book, 'Takhreej al-Halaal wal Haraam' and its text

is 'Takhreej by the Noble Muhaddith Muhammad Naasir ad-Deen al-Albaanee' and that was in the year 1390, about 21 years ago is a false statement, and he had no hand in the takhreej of that book not even one word!!'...

And Saqqaaf goes on to say that al-Albaanee derives evidence from the verse "fa asarrahaa yusuf fee nafsihi" to excuse his silence over this issue for the last 21 years and ends by saying, 'miskeen ya haraam!!'

Now going to the introduction of 'Sifah as-Salaah', al-Albaanee says nothing of the sort! He quotes the verse in relation to a question that he posed to Zuhayr Zawaysh, the person responsible for publishing this book, when he met him as to how his name got on the cover, so Zuhayr replied, 'a error from some of the people in charge', and then Shaykh Naasir quotes this verse, to say that he kept his suspicions quiet!

So look at this lie and see how Saqqaaf plays with words by ending up by saying, 'miskeen yaa haraam!!' Has he no fear of Allaah? Not only this but Saqqaaf accuses al-Albaanee of staying silent of this issue for 21 years! Whereas al-Albaanee discusses this in his checking to 'al-Halaal wal Haraam' entitled 'Gaayatul Maraam' which was written 10 years previous to the above claim of Saqqaaf!

Worse he states that the reason of al-Albaanees silence over this issue is because on the cover of the book were the words 'the noble Shaykh'. Subhanallaah! As if he has looked into Albaanees' heart!

Again in this treatise are more cases, some of them laughable of Saqqaafs criticisms, claims, wild flights of fancy, and conjectural distortions. The interested reader is welcome to refer to these works, and then cross reference to the written works of al-Albaanee.

Saqqaaf states in his footnotes to 'Daf' Shubah at-Tashbeeh' (pg.245-246) of ibn al-Jawzi while trying to prove the classical lie that ibn Taymiyyah held the belief that Allaah was a body of composite parts:

This is what this sick hearted individual states. But why did he omit the word at the beginning of the paragraph that he quotes from, with which ibn Taymiyyah begins: "they said (qaaloo)"?!! For the above words are not the words of ibn Taymiyyah but those of others that held this positions. And then ibn Taymiyyah refutes this position! Ibn Taymiyyah states clearly in some of his works: "Whosoever alleges that the Lord is composite - with the meaning that he accepts division, separation and partition (for Allaah) - then he is the most disbelieving of the people and the most ignorant. Indeed his statement is more evil that he one who claims that Allaah has a son - with the meaning that part of Him has split and thus became His son."

A detailed discussion on the attacks on ibn Taymiyyah are detailed in the section on ibn Taymiyyah:

There is more than enough in what we have written in the previous pages, to show any sincere reader that all of the works of Saqqaaf, and the man himself, cannot be depended upon and that this person is no way a scholar not to speak of being a student of knowledge. We have also shown without doubt the precision and deep knowledge of al-Albaanee in the various sciences of hadeeth, and the self-consistency of his verdicts found in his various books written over a period of more than 55 years! Furthermore we have shown that those verdicts that he changed his opinion on are only to be expected for he like those before him is only human and a man who learns more across the passage of time.

With regards to Saqqaaf then in front of us we have examples running into the hundreds of his lies and distortions, but it is no longer necessary to mention anymore here, and Allaah the Most High is the One who grants success and leads to the straight path.

I suffice here to mention to the interested reader, a selection of the many works of refutation written against Hasan Ali as-Saqqaaf by the noble and sincere scholars of this age:

1. 'al-Kashshaaf `an Dalaalaat Hasan as-Saqqaaf'

2. 'al-Qawl al-Mubeen fee Ithbaat as-Soorah li Rabb al-Aalameen'

3. 'Ittihaaf Ahl al-Fadl wa al-Insaaf bi Naqd Kitaab Daf` Shubah at-Tashbeeh wa Taleeqaat as-Saqqaaf' by the same author, and it is a long and detailed work.

4. 'al-Anwaar al-Kaashifah li Tanaaqadaat al-Khassaaf az-Zaa`ifah'

5. 'al-Eeqaaf `alaa Abaateel Qaamoos Shataa`im as-Saqqaaf'

6. 'al-Ittihaaf bi Aqueedah Shaikh al-Islaam wa at-Tahdheer min Jahmiyyah as-Saqqaaf' by Shaikh Abd al-Kareem al-Humaid

7. 'Iftiraa`aat as-Saqqaaf al-Atheem `alaa al-Albaanee Shaikh al-Muhadditheen' by Shaikh Khaalid al-Inbaree.

8. 'Radd alaa at-Tandeed bi man Adada at-Tawheed' by Shaikh Muhsin al-Abbaad

9. 'as-Sawaa`iq was ash-Shuhub al-Marmiyyah `alaa Dalaalaat wa al-Inhiraafaat as-Saqqaaf al-Bid`iyyah' by Shaikh Abu Wadaa'ah al-Atharee.

Saqqaaf on the Great Companion: Mu'aawiyah:

Shaykh Ali stated the Saqqaaf attacked and abused this companion, however his followers accused him of lying. Here I present a translation of Saqqaafs footnotes to 'Daf` Shubah at-Tashbeeh' provided to me by his own followers to refute their claim.

Saqqaaf states in his footnotes to 'Daf` Shubah' (pg. 237),

"I say: and Mu`aawiyah killed a group of righteous people from the Sahaabah and other noble personalities for the sake of gaining sovereignty. And from those was Abd ar-Rahmaan bin Khaalid bin Waleed. Ibn Jareer said in his 'Taareekh' (3/202) and ibn Atheer in 'al-Kaamil' (3/453) and the wording is his,

'And the reason for his - Abd ar-Rahmaan bin Khaalid bin Waleed - death was that he became prominent in the eyes of the People of Shaam, and they inclined towards him due to his possessing characteristics of his father, and due to his usefulness (to the Muslims) in the Land of the Romans, and due to his great courage. So Mu`aawiyah became afraid and apprehensive of him, and commanded ibn Uthaal, the Christian, that he plan his murder. Mu`aawiyah guaranteed him exemption from his tax for as long as he lived and that he would be placed in charge of the tax revenues of Homs (a land in central Syria).

So when Abd ar-Rahmaan returned from Rum, ibn Uthaal slipped him a poisoned drink through the means of his servants. So he drank it and died at Hums, and Mu`aawiyah fulfilled what he had guaranteed ibn Uthaal.'

I say: is it permissible to kill a Muslim, and Allaah says, 'and whosoever kills a believer deliberately, then his reward is Hellfire, to remain in there forever. And the Anger of Allaah is upon him and His Curse, and a great punishment is prepared for him" (4/93)?! And it was due to this that Hasan al-Basri said, with regards to Mu`aawiyah, as in 'al-Kaamil' (3/487),

'There were four characteristics in Mu`aawiyah, and any one of them would have been a grave offense: His hastening towards evil by the sword against this Ummah until he took the matter (Khilaafate) without consultation, and amongst them were the remaining Sahaabah and other notable people. His passing the rule onto his son, an alcoholic, wearer of silk, and player of musical instruments. His claim to Ziyaad, and the Messenger of Allaah (SAW) said, "the child is for the bed, and for the fornicator is stoning." And he killed Hujr and the companions of Hujr, so woe to him for what he did to Hujr! And woe to him for what he did to the companions of Hujr!'

[This is related without an isnaad in 'al-Kaamil' but there is an isnaad to it in at-Tabaree but it is fabricated according to the standards of the scholars of hadeeth. See 'Ittihaaf Ahl al-Fadl' (vol 1) of Shaikh Naasir al-Alwaan for an in depth discussion. So Saqqaaf is blameworthy for narrating something to prove his corrupt stance which is not quoted with

an isnaad in the reference he gives, and hence impermissible as evidence. Secondly he is blameworthy for quoting something that after investigation turns out to be a fabrication!]

I say: so when the life of Mu`aawiyah is like this!!

[A clear statement that all that has preceded was with regards to this noble companion]

There does not occur anything from the Prophet (SAW) with regards to his virtues, and al-Haafidh adh-Dhahabee quotes in 'Siyar A`laam an-Nubalaa' (3/132) from Ishaaq bin Raahaway that he said, 'there is nothing authentic from the Prophet (SAW) on the virtue of Mu`aawiyah'

And it is established in the Saheeh of Muslim (3/2010 no.2604) from ibn Abbaas that he Prophet (SAW) said to him. 'go and call Mu`aawiyah.' He said, 'so I returned and said, "he is eating"' so the Messenger (SAW) said, 'may Allaah not fill his belly'

And on (pg. 241),

"So is an ijtihaad correct which allows killing Muslims, believing in the Oneness of Allaah.....?!

And is an ijtihaad permissible when there occurs a text (on the point in question)?! And it is mutawaatir from him (SAW) that he said about our Master Ammaar who fought alongside the Leader of the Believers, our Master Ali, 'you will be killed by the aggressive party' as is established in Bukhaaree and Muslim.

So is an ijtihaad valid despite the occurrence of many authentic texts (against it), from amongst them his saying (SAW), with regards to our Master Ali (RA), 'the one to whom I am the mawlaa then Ali is his mawlaa. O Allaah love the one who loves him, and show enmity to the one who shows enmity to him.'

And al-Haafidh adh-Dhahabee said in 'Siyar A`laam an-Nubala' (8/335) about this hadeeth, 'mutawaatir.'

And in the Saheeh of Muslim (no.78 in al-Eemaan) about our Master Ali (RA) from him that he said, 'indeed the promise of the unlettered Prophet (SAW) to me was, "none save a believer will love you, and none save a hypocrite will hate you."'

I say: so what is the ruling on the one that commands abusing and cursing our Master Ali the mawlaa of the believers by the testimony of the Messenger of the Lord of the Universe upon the pulpits?!!

And what is the ruling of the one who tests his subjects by cursing our Master Ali (RA) and to disassociate from him, and kills the one who does not abuse and curse him?!!

And from the strange, truly laughable things after this is that you find ibn Katheer saying in the 'chapter on Covenants (Aqd)' in his 'Taareekh' (8/20) about the virtue of Mu`aawiyah, 'he is Mu`aawiyah bin Abee Sufyaan... uncle of the believers, and the writer of the revelation of the Lord of the Universe, he embraced Islaam and his father and mother were Hindus... on the Day of the Conquest.' Then he said after that, 'and the intention here is to show that Mu`aawiyah used to write the revelation alongside others....'

[This proves that all that has preceded is with regards to Mu`aawiyah. However it should be known that there is no clear authentic text that shows that Mu`aawiyah ever commanded that Ali be abused on the pulpits.]

I say: No, by Allaah other than Whom there is none worthy of worship, your words are not correct O ibn Katheer, and not what you depend upon or what you think. As for your saying, 'uncle of the believers', then this is not correct at all, and that is because this does not occur in any authentic Sunnah or narration. And (building) upon your saying that Mu`aawiyah is the Uncle of the believers - then Habee bin Akhtab, the Jew, would be the grandfather of the believers, because he is the father of Sayyida Safiyyah, the wife of the Messenger (SAW), and this is not so."

I ask the reader: what happened to the advice of all those early scholars that order us to keep silent about the Companions? What happened about having good opinion of our predecessors, especially the Companions?

Enough of a virtue is it for Mu`aawiyah that Allaah chose him to be a writer of His revelation! And it is authentic from the Messenger (SAW) that he prayed for Mu`aawiyah with these words: "O Allaah! Teach Mu`aawiyah the Book, and save him from the fire"[40]

And likewise it is authentic from him, (SAW) that he said about this noble companion, "O Allaah make him one who is guided and guiding"[41]

And the Messenger (SAW) said, "None should revile my Companions, for if one amongst you were to spend as much gold as Uhud, it would not amount to as much as one mudd of one of them or half of it."[42]

And may Allaah have Mercy upon Imaam Abu Zur`ah ar-Raazi who said, "if you see a man speak ill of any of the Companions of the Messenger of Allaah (SAW), then know he is a heretic."[43]

---

[40] Ahmad (4/127), Ibn Hibbaan (566)
[41] 'Silsilah as-Saheehah' (no.1969)
[42] Muslim
[43] 'al-Kifaayah' (pg.97) of Khateeb al-Baghdaadee

Further Examples of Lies From 'at-Tanaaqudaat' of Hasan Saqqaaf:

In case anybody is still left in doubt, I randomly opened up 'at-Tanaaqudaat' and investigated more of his accusations.

Saqqaaf states in his 'Tanaaqadaat' (pg. 102 no.104) about the hadeeth:

"When you sell then say: No deceit. Then every commodity should be sold with a three day choice...."

And says, "I say: al-Albaanee declared this hadeeth weak in 'Da`eef al-Jaami waz Ziyaada' (1/156 no.501) then he placed it in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/41-42 no.1907) so Subhaanallaah!"

al-Albaanee places this hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no. 402) and declares this hadeeth to be da`eef. But there occurs a footnote, "...and al-Albaanee declared this hadeeth to be hasan in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.1907)..."

Conclusion: there is no contradiction as the Shaykh himself indicates his change of verdict on the hadeeth.

Saqqaaf states (pg.103 no.105) about the hadeeth:

"When one of you yawns, then let him place his hand over his mouth and not make a sound, for indeed Shaytaan laughs at him"

And says: "I say: al-Albaanee ruled it to be fabricated in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (1/162 no.523) then I saw him placing it in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (1/159 no.790)!"

al-Albaanee says to the above hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.424), "fabricated" and brings a footnote in which he refers the reader to a similar hadeeth in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (nos. 425-427).

In 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.790) he says to the same hadeeth, "fabricated with this wording, and what is authentic is without the wording, 'do not make a sound'. (See) Al-Mishkaat (993), ad-Da`eefah (no.2420)."

Conclusion: No contradiction, so beware of the lies of the liars!

54- Saqqaaf claims contradiction (pg. 103 no.106) over the hadeeth,

"When a slave girl commits fornication then whip her, and if she commits fornication again then whip her. And if she commits fornication again then whip her. Then sell her even if it be for a rope (dafeer)"

And says, "I say: al-Albaanee declared it da`eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (1/190 no.631) then I saw that he declared it saheeh and placed it in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/83 no.2080). So how amazing!"

al-Albaanee says to this hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.532), "da`eef" and brings a footnote in which he indicates that a hadeeth with similar meaning is in 'Saheeh al-Jaami' (no.587) and that a hadeeth with similar wording is in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.2080) and al-Irwaa` (no.2326).

In Saheeh ibn Maajah (no.2080) he places a hadeeth which has the same wording except that the words 'And if she commits fornication again then whip he' are repeated four times instead of three.

Conclusion: the only thing amazing here is the precision of al-Albaanee! 55 - Saqqaaf claims contradiction (pg. 104 no.107) over the hadeeth,

"When one of you prays and passes wind, then let him hold his nose and leave"

And says, "I say: al-Albaanee declared this hadeeth da`eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami (1/199 no.666) and he mentioned there that he also declared it da`eef in 'ad-Da`eefah' (no. 2576). Then I saw him contradicting himself by declaring the hadeeth saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Majaah' (1/222 no.1008) and he mentioned there that he placed it in 'Saheeh Abu Daawood' (1020)! How amazing!"

al-Albaanee says in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no. 566) to the hadeeth, "da`eef" and there is a footnote, "then our Shaykh declared the hadeeth saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah (no. 1007) and referred to 'Saheeh Abu Daawood' and 'al-Mishkaat'"

Conclusion: Again there is no contradiction where it is indicated clearly that the Shaykh himself has changed his verdict to the hadeeth.

56- Saqqaaf (pg. 104 no.108) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"When the massacre occurs, Allaah will send a party of helpers from Damascus who are the most noble of the Arabs in riding horses, and the best of them with weapons, Allaah will support the religion through them."

And says, "I say: al-Albaanee declared this hadeeth da`eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (1/242 no.826) and mentioned there that it is mentioned in 'ad-Da`eefah' (no.2720). And it is strange that he places this hadeeth in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/390 no.3303) and he mentioned there that he placed this hadeeth in 'as-Saheehah' (no.2777)! How amazing!"

al-Albaanee says in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.726) to the above hadeeth, "da`eef" and refers the reader to 'ad-Da`eefah' (no.2720) and 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.3303)!

In 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no. 3303) he declares the above hadeeth without the wording "from Damascus" to be hasan.

Conclusion: yet again there is nothing strange here as there is no contradiction.

57- Saqqaaf (pg. 105 no.109) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Cause the blood to flow with whatever you wish, and mention the name of Allaah over it."

And says, "al-Albaanee declares this hadeeth da`eef and placed it in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (1/387 no.1360) and likewise he declared it da`eef in 'Ghaayatul Maraam' (pg. 39 no.34) saying, 'da`eef'. And he severely contradicts himself because he declared the hadeeth saheeh and placed it in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/209 no.2573) and he indicated there that he placed this hadeeth in 'Saheeh Abu Daawood' (no. 2515). How amazing!"

al-Albaanee says to the above hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no. 1267), "da`eef" and refers the reader to 'Ghaayatul Maraam' (no.34).

In 'Ghaayatul Maraam' (no.34) he declares the hadeeth da`eef. But there occurs a footnote, "this is what Shaykh Naasir said, then after this he authenticated the hadeeth in 'Saheeh Sunan Abu Daawood' (no. 2450) and 'Saheeh Sunan an-Nasaa`ee' (no.4010) and 'Saheeh Sunan ibn Maajah' (no.2573). See 'Irwaa al-Ghaleel' (8/166)".

Conclusion: Again there is no contradiction where it is stated that the Shaykh has changed his verdict on the hadeeth.

58 - Saqqaaf (pg.105 no.109) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Indeed Allaah has furnished you with a prayer, it is better for you then red camels - the witr - Allaah has placed it between Ishaa and the appearance of fajr for you."

And says: "al-Albaanee declared it saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (1/192 no.958), then he declared it da`eef and placed it in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (2/93 no.1622). So Subhaanallaah!"

al-Albaanee places the hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.1622) and declares it da`eef and refers the reader to 'al-Irwaa' (no.423) and 'Da`eef Abu Daawood' (no.255). Then the Shaykh brings a footnote, "I say: the hadeeth is authentic without the wording 'it is better for you than red camels'. See the other book (Saheeh al-Jaami), 'Indeed Allaah has increased for you....' (no.1772) and 'Ahaadeeth as-Saheehah' (no.108). And the above mentioned saying is with regards to the two rak`ahs of Fajr. See 'as-Saheehah' (no.1141)"

In 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.958) he says to the above hadeeth, "saheeh without the wording 'better for you than red camels'. (See) 'al-Irwaa' (no.423), 'as-Saheehah (nos. 108, 1141), 'Da'eef Abu Dawood' (no.255)"

Conclusion: Subhaanallaah! There is absolutely no contradiction here whatsoever!

Saqqaaf (pg. 106 no.111) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Indeed the poor people of the Muhaajiroon will enter paradise five hundred years before the rich people of the Muhaajiroon"

And says, "al-Albaanee declared the hadeeth saheeh and placed it in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/396 no.3327). And he contradicts himself by declaring it da'eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (2/163 no.1884). So Subhaanallaah!!"

In 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no. 1886) al-Albaanee declared the hadeeth da`eef and there occurs a footnote: "the author declared the hadeeth hasan in 'Raf` al-Astaar...' (no.102) and 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.3327)".

60- Saqqaaf (pg 106 no. 112) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Indeed he (the son of the Prophet) has a wet nurse in Paradise completing his suckling. And had he lived he would have been a truthful prophet...."

Mentioning the hadeeth like this without the penultimate sentence. And says, "I say: al-Albaanee declared it saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (1/253 no.1227). And he contradicts himself because he declares the hadeeth da`eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (2/187 no.1969). So beware!!"

al-Albaanee mentions the full hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.1971) and declares the hadeeth da`eef and refers the reader to 'ad-Da`eefah' (no.3202).

In 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.1227) he says to the full hadeeth, "saheeh without the sentence (containing the word) 'growing old' (i.e. the penultimate sentence). (See) 'ad-Da`eefah' (no. 220, 3202)"

Conclusion: again no contradiction at all.

Saqqaaf (pg.107 no.113) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Indeed the world is only an enjoyment, and there is no object of this world more excellent than a righteous woman."

And says, "I say: al-Albaanee declared the weak da`eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (2/209 no.2047) saying 'da`eef'. Then I saw placing the hadeeth in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (1/312 no.1504) saying, 'saheeh'."

Al-Albaanee declared the hadeeth da`eef in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.2049) and there occurs a footnote, "he declared it saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.1504) and referred to 'ad-Da`eefah' (no.5177)."

Saqqaaf (pg. 107 no. 114) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Any person who takes out a loan and while being determined not to repay it will meet Allaah as a thief."

And says, "al-Albaanee declared this hadeeth saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/52 no. 1954) saying 'hasan saheeh'. Then I saw him contradicting himself by placing it also in his book 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (2/265 no.2234) saying 'da`eef'."

The above hadeeth I found in 'Saheeh Jaami' (no. 2720) but no verdict was given on it. In 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (no.1954) he declared it hasan saheeh. (i.e hasan with respect to isnaad and saheeh with respect to text as he explains in his introduction to this work.)

Conclusion: there is no contradiction here.

Saqqaaf (pg. 107 no. 115) claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Take your due with honesty and uprightedness..."

And says, "al-Albaanee declared it saheeh in 'Saheeh ibn Maajah' (2/54 no.1966) saying 'hasan saheeh'. Then I saw that he placed it in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (2/265 no.2234) saying 'da`eef'."

Conclusion: criticism here seems correct

64- (no. 116) I have left out as I could not find the hadeeth in one of the references that Saqqaaf gave.

Saqqaaf claims contradiction over the hadeeth,

"Eat the olive and rub its (oil on yourselves) for indeed it is a blessed goodness."

And said, "al-Albaanee declared it saheeh and mentioned it in 'Silsilah as-Saheehah' (1/654 no.379) and he contradicts himself by weakening this hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (4/154 no.4208)..."

al-Albaanee says to the above hadeeth in 'Da`eef al-Jaami' (no.4203), "da`eef" and refers the reader to 'Silsilah as-Saheehah' (no.379)!

In 'Silsilah as-Saheehah' (no.379) al-Albaanee declares the hadeeth, "eat the olive and rub it for indeed it is from a blessed tree" to be hasan and during the course of his discussion declares the above mentioned hadeeth of Abu Hurayrah to be da`eef.

So again there is no contradiction.

And Allaah the Most High knows best and He is the One Who guides to the truth.

A Brief Analysis of 'Qaamoos Ash-Shataa`im':

On page 79, Kabbani yet again launches into yet another attack against the Shaykh and Muhaddith Naasir ad-Deen al-Albaanee, may Allaah preserve him, with the chapter heading, "Nasir ad-Din al-Albani's Tampering of Bukhari, His Attacks on the Scholars, and His Innovations in Doctrine."

And what has he as a reference? The book, 'Dictionary of Albaanee's insults and heinous words he uses against the scholars of the Community' of the Arch-Liar (kadhdhaab) and the Deceiver, Hasan Alee as-Saqqaaf who has blackened the pages of all of his books with lies, accusations, lack of research, and a sectarianism which is blind to truth and justice.

al-Albaanee 'tampering with Bukhaaree': the falsehood of this can be seen in what has preceded and it will also be seen that it is Saqqaaf, Kawtharee and others of a similar vein who are the true people who tamper with al-Bukharee, but will Kabbani attack these people? Never! Because they belong to his sect, and sectarianism is blind to justice!

As regards to his 'insults and heinous words he uses against the scholars of the Community': We would challenge Saqqaaf and Kabbani to write a book on the vile and heinous words that were used by Zaahid al-Kawtharee against the Scholars of this community if they are truly just, and to direct their unjust attacks against al-Albaanee to Kawtharee!

As regards the examples that are given, then in general: We would say that Saqqaaf has done well in cutting up, semi-quoting, and misquoting the Muhaddith of this age, al-Albaanee, and he has presented the following statements as if they were attacks on the very scholarly nature of the Imaams in question when in truth they are far from that! So here are what Saqqaaf and Kabbani quote followed by what al-Albaanee really says:

He says of Imam Abu Hanifah: "The imams have declared him weak for his poor memorisation" (in his commentary of Ibn Abu `Asim's 'Kitaab al-Sunnah' 1:76) although Ibn Hajr Asqalani reports no such position in his 'Tahdib al-tahdhib'

We are reluctant to discuss this topic with regards to this great Imaam, but since Saqqaaf has made the accusation we reply by saying: that fact that he was da`eef was the position of ibn al-Mubaarak, ath-Thawree, ibn Ma`een in one of two sayings from him, Ahmad, Muslim, Nasaa`ee, ibn Adee, ibn Sa`d, al-Uqailee, ibn Abee Haatim, ad-Daaruqutnee, al-

Haakim, Abdul Haqq al-Ishbelee, adh-Dhahabee, Bukhaaree, ibn al-Jawzee, ibn Shaheen, [al-Qurtobee, ibn Abdul Barr] and others.

Saqqaaf cuts up the words of al-Albaanee, here are his full words, "its isnaad is da`eef, its narrators are trustworthy being the narrators of Bukhaaree, except Abu Haneefah for he, despite his excellence in fiqh, the Imaams have declared him weak for his poor memorisation, and I have mentioned the names of these Imaams in 'ad-Da`eefah'..."

Al-Albaanee says in ad-Da`eefah [1/572] concerning an isnaad containing Abu Haneefah, "the narrators of this isnaad are trustworthy and precise except Abu Haneefah who has been declared to be weak due to his poor memorisation by Bukhaaree, Muslim, an-Nasaa`ee, ibn Adee and other Imaams of Hadeeth. This is why ibn Hajr in 'at-Taqreeb' does not go beyond describing him as, 'the famous faqeeh'."

He says in ad-Da`eefah [1/662+], "I will mention here the texts from the Imaams, from those that are authentic to them, so that the reader may be upon sure knowledge concerning this and not think that this is some new ijtihaad from me for all that is done here is to follow the People of Knowledge and specialists in the field. Allaah the Mighty and Magnificent says, 'ask the people of knowledge of you do not know' and He says, 'ask about Him from any who are acquainted.'

Imaam Bukhaaree said in 'Taareekh al-Kabeer' [4/2/81], "they have remained silent about him."

Al-Haafidh ibn Katheer says in 'Mukhatasar Uloom al-Hadeeth' [pg. 118], "if al-Bukhaaree says about a a man, 'they have remained silent about him' or 'he has a problem' then he is in the lowest and worst levels with him - but he is mild in his use of terms of criticism so know this."

Al-Iraaqee said in his 'Sharh al-Alfiyyah', "al-Bukhaaree says this about those whose hadeeth is abandoned." Refer to 'ar-Raf` wa at-Takmeel' [pg. 282-183]

Al-Marwazee says in 'Masaa`il al-Imaam Ahmad', "I asked: when is the hadeeth of a person abandoned? He replied: when he more often than not makes mistakes."

So consider carefully since this saying of al-Bukhaaree is qualified criticism - contrary to what some people think.

Imaam Muslim says in 'al-Kunaa wal Asmaa' [q. 31/1], "mudtarib al-hadeeth (confused and mixes up hadeeth). He does not have many authentic hadeeth."

Imaam an-Nasaa`ee says at the end of 'ad-Du`afaa wal Matrookeen' [pg. 57], "he is not strong in hadeeth and he makes many mistakes despite the fact that he only narrates a few narrations."

Ibn Adee says in 'al-Kaamil' [2/403], "he has some acceptable hadeeth but most of what he narrates are mistakes, errors and incorrect additions in isnaads and texts and errors regarding peoples names - most of what he narrates is like this. Out of all that he narrates, only ten odd ahaadeeth are authentic and he has narrated around three hundred ahaadeeth including famous and strange ones - all of them in this way. This is because he is not from the People of Hadeeth and hadeeth are not taken from one such as this in the field of hadeeth."

Ibn Sa`d said in 'at-Tabaqaat' [6/256], "he is da`eef in hadeeth."

Al-Uqailee says in 'ad-Du`afaa' [pg. 432], "Abdullaah bin Ahmad narrated to us saying: I heard my father (Imaam Ahmad) say: the hadeeth of Abu Haneefah are da`eef."

Ibn Abee Haatim said in 'al-Jarh wat-Ta`deel' [4/1/450], "Hajjaaj bin Hamzah narrated to us saying:Abdaan ibn Uthmaan narrated to us saying: I heard ibn al-Mubaarak say: Abu Haneefah was miskeen (poor) with regards hadeeth."

These two isnaads (of 6&7) are saheeh. I have checked them so that no one should think that perhaps they are like some of the isnaads quoted in the biography of the Imaam in 'Taareekh Baghdaad'.

Abu Hafs ibn Shaaheen said, "Abu Haneefah with regards to fiqh then no one can fault his knowledge however he was not pleasing in hadeeth..." As is quoted at the end of 'Taareekh al-Jarjaan' [pg. 510-511]

Ibn Hibbaan said, "...hadeeth was not his field. He reported one hundred and thirty musnad ahaadeeth and no more, erring in one hundred and twenty either through reversing the isnaads or changing the text without knowing. Therefore when his errors outweigh that which he is correct in it is deserving to leave depending upon him in narrations."

Ad-Daaruqutnee says in his Sunan [pg. 132]...., "no one reports it from Musa ibn Abee Aa`ishah except Abu Haneefah and al-Hasan ibn Umaarah and both are da`eef."

Al-Haakim quotes in 'Ma`rifah al-Ulum al-Hadeeth' [pg. 256] amongst a group of narrators of the Atbaa` at-Taabi`een and those who came after them - whose ahaadeeth are not accepted in the Saheeh concluding by saying, "so all those we have mentioned are people well known for having narrated - but are not counted as being amongst the reliable precise memorisers."

Al-Haafidh Abdul Haqq al-Ishbeelee mentions 'al-Ahkaam al-Kubraa' [q. 17/2], ..."Abu Haneefah is not used as a proof due to his weakness in hadeeth."

Ibn al-Jawzee mentions him in ‘Kitaab ad-Du`faah wal Matrookeen’ [3/163] mentioning the weakening of the Imaams of him and from ath-Thawree that he said, "he is not trustworthy and precise." And from an-Nadr ibn Shameel, "abandoned in hadeeth."

Adh-Dhahabee says in ‘ad-Du`afaah’, "an-Nu`maan, the Imaam, may Allaah have mercy upon him. Ibn Adee said: most of what he narrates are mistakes, errors and additions and he has some acceptable ahaadeeth. An-Nasaa`ee said: he is not strong in hadeeth, he makes many errors and mistakes even though he does not narrate very much. Ibn Ma`een said: his hadeeth are not to be recorded."

[Translators addition: al-Qurtobee said at the beginning of his tafseer [1/86], "...and Abu Haneefah and he is da`eef."

Al-Haafidh al-Mubaarakfooree said in ‘Tuhfatul Ahwadhee’ [1/333], "...it is singularly narrated by Imaam Abu Haneefah and he has weak memory as was made clear by al-Haafidh ibn Abdul Barr. Allaah knows best,"]

Al-Albaanee says following his note on ibn Ma`een, "and the meaning of this report from ibn Ma`een is that with him Abu Haneefah is one of the da`eef narrators. This clarifies for us that the declaration of reliability of ibn Ma`een that al-Haafidh mentions in ‘at-Tahdheeb’ is not his only saying concerning him. What is correct is that he had varying opinions about him - sometimes declaring him reliable and at others declaring him weak as in this report. Sometimes he said, as is reported by ibn Mihriz in ‘Ma`rifah ar-Rijaal’ [1/6/2], ‘Abu Haneefah was alright and he had not used to lie’ and at other times, ‘Abu Haneefah was truthful in our view and he is not accused of lying.’

And there is no doubt in our view that Abu Haneefah was one of the truthful - but this is not enough for his ahaadeeth to be accepted until there is added to this precision and memory - and that is not established from him - may Allaah have mercy upon him, rather the opposite is established by the witness of the ulemaa whom we have mentioned - and they are those whose witness if accepted, will not lead the one who follows them astray - and that this is no way alters the position of Abu Haneefah - may Allaah have mercy upon him - as regards to his deen, piety and fiqh...since how many scholars, judges and pious people have had there memories criticised by the scholars of hadeeth and likewise their lack of precision - but none of that is taken to be a criticism of their deen or trustworthy character. And this is known to those who occupy themselves with the biographies of narrators - and the likes of this are the Qaadee Muhammad ibn Adur Rahmaan ibn Abee Laylaa, the scholar Hammaad ibn Abe Sulaymaan, the Qaadee Shareek ibn Abdullaah, and Abbaad ibn Katheer and others...."

He says in his ‘Prophets Prayer Described’ [pg.ix] , "...and this is the justification for why Abu Haneefah has sometimes unintentionally contradicted the authentic ahaadeeth - and it is perfectly acceptable reason for Allaah does not burden a soul with more than it can bear - it is not permissible to insult him for it as some ignorant people have done. In fact, it

is obligatory to respect him, for he is one of the Imaams of the Muslims through whom this deen has been preserved and handed down to us..."

Al-Albaanee concludes his discussion in ad-Da`eefah by saying, "so we conclude with the words of adh-Dhahabee in 'Siyar A`laam an-Nubulaa' [5/288/1], 'his being an Imaam in fiqh and its fine points is accepted and there is no doubt in this...'"

So in conclusion we would like to say: The criticism levelled against Abu Haneefah is not with regards his deen, or belief, or character or fiqh rather it was with regards his memorisation. So whosoever wishes to reply to this then let him address this point and not divert from the issue.

Also we would like to ask the reader: where in the above analysis have we seen al-Albaanee using 'heinous' words?!

He describes Suyuti as a 'loud mouth' (ja'ja- Da'eefah 3:189) who 'contradicts himself' (4:386) and he asks of Suyuti 'has he no shame?' (Da'eefah 3:479)

I have not been able to find the first quote at all, and I am sure that this quote is a blatant lie. What confirms this was that I was able to find Saqqaaf's page references for other quotes from vol. 3 of 'ad-Da`eefah'. In fact while searching for this quote I read pp 185-192 and Suyutee was mentioned only twice (pages 186, 187).

As for the second quote: after mentioning a hadeeth containing a narrator about which ibn Hajr said, "the Nuqqaad (precise scholars) are agreed that he is a liar" he says, "and it is an amazement from as-Suyutee that he is not embarrassed to blacken his book 'al-Jaami as-Sagheer' by including this hadeeth in it." Now this phrase is worlds apart from the statement 'has he no shame'!! One statement related to a specific example, the other is quoted such that it seems that al-Albaanee is giving a verdict on the very character of as-Suyutee!

As for the third quote: al-Albaanee discusses a fabricated hadeeth (no.1913) and says, "and as-Suyuti includes the hadeeth in 'Dhail al-Mawdoo`aat' (pg. 53)...." [his collection of fabricated narrations] Then later on he states, "...then as-Suyutee contradicts himself (tanaaqada -singular)) by including it in 'al-Jaami as-Sagheer' from the same narration" [and in the introduction to the 'al-Jaami' as-Suyutee made clear that he included only authentic ahaadeeth]. So I ask you, is this an example of a heinous word or an insult, or a statement of fact and a clear case of exaggeration from Saqqaaf?

He blames al-Hakim, al-Mundhiri, and al-Dhahabi's "poor scholarliness and proneness to imitation" because they all declared a hadith sound and he ~ Albani ~ disagrees with them ('ad-Da'eefah' 3:416).

In 'ad-Da`eefah' (3:416) Al-Albaanee says about a sanad to a hadeeth: "al-Haakim said saheeh sanad! and adh-Dhahabee agreed! and al-Mundhiree endorsed this in 'at-Taqreeb'

(3/166)! And all this is from neglect in research and submitting to taqleed. And how could it be otherwise? For how is it possible for a Researching Scholar to authenticate the likes of this isnaad. For Muhammad bin al-Farraat (one of it's narrators) is weak by agreement... [and he mentions the Imaams verdicts on him].... and adh-Dhahabee himself includes him in 'al-Meezaan' due to these texts (of declaring him weak), and he mentioned this hadeeth of his [i.e. the hadeeth to the isnaad as an example of a weak hadeeth that he narrated]. And Boosayree said in 'az-Zawaa`id' (2/146) 'its isnaad is da`eef. Muhammad bin al-Farraat is agreed upon as being weak...'"

So look to this great exaggeration! Generalising a phrase that mentions a specific occurrence of error of these Imaams to one that seems to attack their scholarship.

Of Ibn Hajr Asqalani: "Self-contradictory" ('Da`eefah' 3:267).

In 'Da`eefah' (3:267) al-Albaanee discusses the difference of opinion over whether or not Ja`da (who is ibn Hubayra al-Asjalee) is a Companion, "and ibn Hajr's opinion over him was self-contradictory (tanaaqada ra`i ibn Hajr feehee) for in 'at-Tahdheeb' he agrees with the saying of ibn Abee Haatim that he was a Taabi`ee. But in 'at-Taqreeb' he is certain that he is a Lesser Companion. And it is not hidden from the student of knowledge that this contradiction from the likes of this Haafidh does not occur except that there is no definite evidence that Ja`da is a Companion..."

Is there a clearer misquote than this?! And this sums up the approach of the contemporary (and some classical) Ash`arees when attacking the Salafiyyah - lies, misquotes, semi-quotes, and exaggerations, some of which you have read already and more you will read. And this is typical of the type of attacks that were launched against al-Albaanee in particular by the likes of Ghumaree, Abu Ghuddah, al-Bootee, Mahmud Sa`eed, and al-A`dhamee. And it was because of their blatant lies that al-Albaanee spoke harshly against them. Insha`Allaah the above few examples are enough to show the trend of this section (not to speak of others), the interested reader is asked to refer the rest of the quotes mentioned therein to the works of al-Albaanee.

With regards to the next section concerning the points of fiqh which commences (pg. 81), "it is no wonder that Albani shows everybody who doesn't agree with him such enmity, considering the extent of his innovations in religion..."

Then suffice it to know that each opinion of his is backed by authentic ahaadeeth, and held by Imaams of the past (even if in a minority). With this in mind, it is impossible, even according to the definition that the likes of Kabbani hold to, to call such opinions 'innovations'. Again this declaration is merely a case of untruths and exaggerations - as such we will not delve into these, but again the interested reader can refer to any book of fiqh written by a Researching Scholar. We will deal, however, with four points:

He compares the Hanafi fiqh to the Gospel as mentioned above (In his commentary to Mundhiri's 'Mukhtasar Sahih Muslim' 3rd ed....)"

Saqqaaf repeats in his book (on pg.26), "that he likens the fiqh of Islaam as exemplified in the four madhhabs and others to the Corrupted Gospel!"

al-Albaanee brings a footnote to the hadeeth in Saheeh Muslim concerning Jesus' (AS) descent to this earth at the end of which occurs, "and he will lead you with the Book of your Lord and the Sunnah of your Prophet." - 'This makes it clear that Jesus will rule by our Sharee`ah, and pass verdicts based upon the Qur'aan and Sunnah, not upon the Gospel or the Hanafee fiqh or the likes."

To the intelligent reader it is clear that no such comparison has been made in this statement. Furthermore it is clear that Saqqaaf has added the statement of the four madhhabs from himself as is his habit, then he understands from this phrase of the Shaykh that al-Albaanee has abused the Hanafee madhhab and this far from the truth. Rather this phrase has been mentioned by a number of scholars of the past because it is mentioned in some of the works of the Hanafees that when Jesus returns, he will rule by the Hanafee madhhab, hence the origin of the above statement from al-Albaanee.

Al-Albaanee says in a footnote to his 'Mukhtasar Saheeh al-Bukhaaree' (2/443), "and some of the partisan Hanafees have capitalised on this (statement) and have brought to public notice that I have abused the Hanafee madhab! The truth is that I pointed to a refutation of some of the partisan People of Knowledge from amongst them who made clear that Jesus (AS) shall rule by the Hanafee madhhab! And this is widely believed in some of the non-Arab lands. Shaykh al-Barzanjee said in 'al-Ishaa'a li Asraat as-Saa'a', "it has occurred that some of the ignorant Hanafees claimed that both Jesus and the Mahdee shall follow the Madhhab of Imaam Abu Haneefah, and I came across the work of Shaykh Alee al-Qaaree called 'al-Mashrab al-Wardee fee Madhab al-Mahdee' in which he quoted this saying and he refuted it completely and declared the one who said it to be ignorant....""

In the introduction to later editions of 'Mukhtasar Saheeh Muslim' (New Print, 1411H pp 5-11) al-Albaanee replied in full to this accusation. This indicates the fallacy of what Kabbani writes as a footnote (pg. 79), "the comparison was removed from later editions."

"He claims it is lawful to eat in Ramadan before Maghrib as is defined by the law, and similarly after the true dawn."

By Allaah this is a grievous lie! In 'Tamaam al-Minnah' (pp.'s 425+) after agreeing with the author of 'Fiqh as-Sunnah' that eating deliberately breaks one's fast [this is indicated by his not following up this statement with anything] he follows with the statement, "the author does present the opinion for the one who breaks his fast of Ramadaan deliberately, does he have to make it up (Qadaa) or not? The clear opinion is the second (option)...."

So the only thing that al-Albaanee says of the one who breaks his fast deliberately is that he cannot make it up with the exception of the one who breaks it due to sexual intercourse because of the evidence that occurs concerning that. This is the opinion reported from the Four Caliphs, ibn Mas'ud and Abu Hurayra.

This is from one perspective, then from the other Shaykh Alee Hasan says in his superb refutation to the aforementioned book of Saqqaaf, 'al-Eeqaaf' (pg. 53), "the words of Our Shaykh (al-Albaanee) are directed towards the permissibility of eating before the Adhaan (of Maghrib) if the sun has set, and is observed to have set, yet the adhaan is said late." As for the second half of the accusation then "the truth of the opinion of our Shaykh is that it concerns the adhaan which is said before the true dawn (al-Fajr as-Saadiq) so he allowed eating (after this adhaan)..." And al-Haafidh ibn Hajr indicated in 'al-Fath al-Baaree' (4/199) to the practice of some people of delaying the adhaan of Maghrib, and being early with the Adhaan of Fajr and that this was a rejected innovation.

"He claims that Allaah is in a place above the Throne called al-makan al-adami"

Before answering this it is necessary to make one aware of 3 principles that the scholars use in criticising:

1) The terminologies that the scholar under criticism uses are to be understood as he meant them to be understood.

2) If a certain phrase can be understood in one of two ways - one that conforms to the usul of that scholars and the second that contradicts it - then the phrase is to be understood in the way that confirms to that usul.

3) The implications of a certain phrase are not to be taken as the madhhab of that scholar in the case that they contradict his usul.

These three basics are commonly ignored by the sufis unfortunately as this case will show.

Firstly al-Albaanee himself does NOT say that Allaah is in a makaan (place) as testified to by a three cassette debate with him and the students of Saqqaaf (in which he totally destroyed them) entitled 'hal lillaahi makaan'.

What he does do is discuss the intended meaning behind those scholars that did use the term makaan with reference to Allaah (e.g. Uthmaan bin Sa`eed ad-Daarimee etc..). He states that either one means by makaan 'makaan al-wujoodee' meaning, according to his terminology, a place subject to time and place, or that one means by makaan 'makaan al-adamee' meaning a place that is not subject to time and place i.e. that which is outside creation. He then goes on to say that none of the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah ever intended the first meaning when they said Allaah is in a makaan.

The interested reader can refer to Albaanee's introduction to 'Mukhtasar al-Uluw' for confirmation of what I write.

So this is a clear example of the sufis deliberately misunderstanding the intent of al-Albaanee when he discussed this.

A final point here to note is that when we understand the meaning of the scholars when they used makaan (whether they should have even used this word or not is not the point here) then we can understand the ridiculous nature of the claim of those that say: they have confined Allaah to a locality. This is beacuse the implications of a phrase are not to be taken as the madhab of that scholar in the case that it contradicts his usul (not to mention when he clearly means something totally different!)